COLLECTION LATOMUS
Fondée par Marcel RENARD
VOLUME 177

Bruce MacBAIN

Prodigy and expiation : a study in religion and politics in Republican Rome

Published with the Help of the Boston University



LATOMUS
REVUE D'ÉTUDES LATINES
60, RUE COLONEL CHALTIN
BRUXELLES
1982

LATOMUS

REVUE D'ÉTUDES LATINES

60, rue Colonel Chaltin, B. 1180 Bruxelles

La revue **Latomus**, fondée en 1937 par M.-A. **Kugener**, L. **Herrmann** et M. **Renard** et dirigée actuellement par MM. Léon HERRMANN, Marcel RENARD et Guy CAMBIER, publie des articles, des variétés et discussions, des notes de lecture, des comptes rendus, des notices bibliographiques, des informations pédagogiques ayant trait à tous les domaines de la latinité : textes, littérature, histoire, institutions, archéologie, épigraphie, paléographie, humanisme, etc.

Les quelque **1000 pages** qu'elle comporte actuellement contiennent une riche documentation, souvent **inédite** et abondamment **illustrée**.

Montant de l'abonnement au tome XLI (1982) :

Abonnement ordinaire : 1500 FB.

Port et expédition en sus.
Prix des tomes publiés avant l'année en cours : 2000 FB.
Les quatre fascicules d'un tome ne sont pas vendus séparément.

C.C.P. **000-0752646-23** de la **Société d'études latines de Bruxelles.**

Pour l'achat des tomes I à XXI, s'adresser à :
Johnson Reprint Corporation,
111, Fifth Avenue, New York 3, New York.

Correspondants :

ARGENTINE : M. le Prof. Fr. NÓVOA, Laprida, 1718, Buenos-Aires.

BRÉSIL : M. le Prof. Vandick LONDRES DA NÓBREGA, 32, Rua Araucaria, Jardim Botanico, Rio-de-Janeiro.

ÉTATS-UNIS ET CANADA : M. le Prof. J. R. WORKMAN, Brown University, Providence 12, Rhode Island.

ESPAGNE : J.-M. BLÁZQUEZ, Instituto de Arqueologia, 4, Duque de Medinaceli, Madrid.

FRANCE : M. J. HEURGON, Membre de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres, Le Verger, Allée de la Pavillonne, 78170 – La-Celle-St-Cloud.

GRANDE-BRETAGNE : M. le Prof. Fergus MILLAR, Dept. of History, University College of London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT.

ITALIE : M^{lle} M. L. PALADINI, 13, Via Bellotti, Milano.

PAYS-BAS : M. le Dr. K. H. E. SCHUTTER, 6, Sloetstraat, Nimègue.

SUÈDE : M; le Prof. G. SAEFLUND, 52, 1 tr. Vasagatan, 11120, Sotckholm.

SUISSE : M. A. CATTIN, 14, Grand-Rue, Cormondrèche (Neuchâtel), Suisse.

IMPRIMERIE UNIVERSA, B-9200 WETTEREN (BELGIQUE)

COLLECTION LATOMUS
Fondée par Marcel RENARD
VOLUME 177

Bruce MacBAIN

Prodigy and expiation : a study in religion and politics in Republican Rome

Published with the Help of the Boston University



LATOMUS
REVUE D'ÉTUDES LATINES
60, RUE COLONEL CHALTIN
BRUXELLES
1982

D/1981/0415/94
ISBN 2-87031-117-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE RELIABILITY OF THE PRODIGY LISTS (1)

Prodigies, whose occurrence signified to the Roman mind a rupture of the *pax deorum* which required healing through expiatory rites, have typically been viewed in one of two ways. Roman historians have tended to focus either on those occasions in the later Republic when prodigy reports, like the other apparatus of the state religion, were manipulated cynically in the interests of party politics ; or else they have seen in them evidence simply of the superstitious hysteria of the Roman masses at times of grave crisis to the state. No one will deny some measure of truth to both of these observations. But neither point of view – the cynical or the hysterical – can carry us very far toward an understanding of how the prodigy phenomenon functioned as an important collective experience of the Roman and Italian peoples over several centuries in the history of the Republic. To approach an answer to that question it is necessary to ask ourselves what prodigies and expiations *did* ; what legitimate social and political ends (as well as inner psychological ones) they subserved ? Such a complex phenomenon is not likely to yield to a single, embracing explanation. But it may be suggested that one important end which prodigies and expiations served was communication. Throughout most of the Republican period, at any rate, many of the prodigies can be seen to operate as a kind of signalling system whereby the Roman senate, by accepting as *prodigia publica* those prodigies especially which were reported from the non-Roman towns of Italy, could acknowledge the anxieties and identify with the religious sensibilities of Italians, particularly at times of severe stress upon the whole fabric of the confederacy. The senate could occasionally as well convey warnings or

(1) This study began as a dissertation entitled *The Function of Public Prodigies and their Expiations in Furthering the Aims of Roman Imperialism in Italy Down to the Period of the Social War*, which was submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania in February, 1976. I owe a large debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Robert E. A. Palmer for his encouragement and many helpful suggestions. Whatever errors remain are my own.

other sub-texts through the content of expiatory rites, and, overall, by appropriating the responsibility to expiate non-Roman prodigies at Rome with Roman priests, could assert Roman hegemony over Italy in the religious sphere parallel to its assertion of hegemony in the temporal sphere. In short, the prodigy phenomenon, like many another aspect of Roman religion, is one in which religious and political motives blend insensibly together in the hands of a governing class who were not, for the most part, Ciceronian rationalists, or Polybian cynics, but who possessed the ability to both be religious and use religion, with no twinge of hypocrisy, for political advantage.

Before pursuing this hypothesis, however, it will first be necessary to deal at some length with the disputed question of the reliability of our prodigy reports – which we have chiefly from Livy and the Livian-derived *Liber Prodigiorum* of Julius Obsequens, with a scattering of reports from a number of other authors (2). The most serious recent criticism of this material has come from Elizabeth Rawson (3). She calls attention to a number of apparent statistical oddities in the distribution of the prodigy data, and argues from these that our lists represent not even a sampling of the presumably archival material but rather a heavily distorted conflation of a number of special epitomes of prodigies from a few locales, or of those in which haruspices took an interest, or simply of wonder tales given a specious date and locale by such late historians as Coelius Antipater and Cornelius Sisenna.

That our lists are incomplete goes without saying. It is also true that there is some (though actually very little) clearly apocryphal material (4).

(2) There are two systematic collections of the prodigies : F. LUTERBACHER, *Der Prodigienglaube und Prodigienstil der Römer* (Programm Burgdorf, 1880) and L. WÜLKER, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Prodigienwesens bei den Römern* (Diss., Leipzig, 1903).

(3) Elizabeth RAWSON, "The Prodigy Lists and the Use of the *Annales Maximi*", *CQ* 21 (1971), 158-169. Her criticism is directed chiefly at the more optimistic appraisal of J. E. A.CRAKE, "The Annals of the Pontifex Maximus", *CP* 35 (1940), 357-386.

(4) Examples are the rain of flesh in 461 B.C., the apparition of Jupiter to Titus Latinius in 490 B.C., the prodigies of the Lacus Curtius and the Capitoline head, and some elements, at least, of the story of the Alban lake in 398 B.C. The apocryphal prodigies are nearly all early but general arguments about the earliest date at which "archival" material may be considered reliable need not detain us. The great bulk of prodigy reports is not earlier than the third century B.C. and the few earlier instances must be judged each on its own merits. Two of the earliest recorded prodigies, in fact, may be externally verifiable : a prodigious earthquake of 461 B.C. (LIVY 3.10, 5-7 ; DION. HAL. 10.2, 2-6) is connected with seismic disturbances in Greece, especially the Spartan earthquake of 464 by OGILVIE

There are too, it seems, a small number of erroneous doublets in otherwise distinct lists separated generally by an interval of two to four years. Rawson has argued from this that our lists represent a conflation of a number of separate late collections which used varying A.U.C. chronologies and that, in combining them, duplication arose from the same sort of inadvertance which sometimes led Livy to duplicate portions of his narrative when switching from one source to another. Further, if it is unlikely, as Rawson assumes, that the *Annales Maximi* used any sort of A.U.C. chronology, then a demonstration of confusion in the lists attributable to such a cause will break the link between the *Annales* and the lists (5). The difficulty with this is that the number of doublets – not more than about twenty at most and probably far fewer than that – is either too many or too few to satisfy her hypothesis (6). If the prodigy lists which were conflated bore no relationship to any archival source at all, but were entirely the free inventions of historians like Coelius and Sisenna, who, as Rawson suggests, employed the stock portents of hellenistic historiography to dramatize their narratives, then it is not clear why there should be any doublets at all. It is incredible that wholly fabricated lists would by sheer coincidence have assigned the same prodigy to the same locale in the same consular year on even one occasion, let alone on several. On the other hand, if the conflated lists were, in fact, lengthy samplings of genuine archival material, then one would expect many more doublets to be found. Whole segments of prodigy lists should be duplicated as indeed whole narrative episodes are when Livy has switched sources. But this is not the case. We should have expected much more duplication than the few scattered instances that one may point to of doublets imbedded in lists which are otherwise wholly distinct. That there is some degree of error in parts of some lists may be

(*Commentary on Livy, Books I-V* [Oxford, 1965], 415) ; a prodigious plague at Rome in 433 B.C. (LIVY 4.25,3) can perhaps be associated with the plague at Athens in 429.

(5) RAWSON, *art. cit.*, 161.

(6) WÜLKER (*op. cit.*, 23) listed a number of possible doublets to which Rawson has added others (p. 160). At most about two dozen items can be cited of which perhaps five are really striking : 200 B.C. and 198 B.C. – a pig with a human head at Sinuessa ; 177 and 174 – a talking cow/ox in Campania ; 130 and 124 – a rain of milk *in Graecostasi* at Rome ; 183 and 181 – a rain of blood *in area Vulcani et Concordiae* ; 182 and 179 – a storm damaging the Capitol at Rome and a three-footed mule born at Reate. (References to these prodigies and others noted subsequently may be found in the table in Appendix A, pp. 82 ff.

granted. Record keeping in antiquity was never an exact science. Particularly in the case of prodigy lists where very large numbers of similar events were handled and re-handled, it would be surprising indeed if doublets and other forms of confusion did not occasionally occur. But the amount of this duplication which can be detected will not sustain Rawson's hypothesis of massive confusion in the lists due to the conflation of disparate sources, archival or otherwise.

More curious is the disproportionately heavy reporting of some sixteen cities, of which Lanuvium heads the list with fifteen prodigy reports – five times the average number (7) ; and the odd distribution of half a dozen cities from federate Etruria whose prodigy reports are heavily concentrated in the years from 108 to 91 B.C. and virtually monopolize the reporting from all federate cities together during those years (8). But despite these anomalies I do not believe that Rawson's theory of distortion through special epitomes can be sustained.

If we should entertain the possibility that these few cities are heavily over-represented in our sources because of the intrusion of special collections of their prodigies into the annalistic record at the expense of a

(7) The average number is three ; that is, 292 prodigy reports divided by 96 named cities, regions, or *populi*. The sixteen cities which have double or more the average number are :

Lanuvium	15	Cumae	7
Tarracina	11	Praeneste	7
Capua	10	Frusino	7
Reate	10	Veii	7
Caere	9	Formiae	7
Anagnia	8	Privernum	6
Amiternum	8	Aricia	6
Arretium	7	(Cures) Sabini	6

These sixteen cities, which represent about sixteen per cent of all prodigy reporting cities or regions, account for 131 prodigy reports – or 44 per cent of the total number for Italian cities exclusive of Rome. It will be noticed that all of these are located in the 'heartland' region of prodigy reporting – the contiguous area of Latium, Campania, Sabineland, and Etruria (see Appendix C, pp. 114 ff.) A curious phenomenon is the extent to which some high-scoring cities from the same region tend to be mutually exclusive in their reporting years. Thus, Capua and Cumae, with a total of seventeen reporting years share only one year (208 B.C.) ; Reate and Amiternum with a total of eighteen reporting years, share no year ; Caere and Veii, with a total of sixteen reporting years, share only one year (174 B.C.). The two highest scoring cities of Latium (exclusive of Rome), Lanuvium and Tarracina, with a total of twenty-six reporting years, share three years (204, 166, and 147 B.C.).

(8) Below, n. 29.

more representative sampling, then it would seem that the most likely place to look for evidence of such epitomes might be among the antiquarians of the late Republic who could be suspected of having made collections of the prodigies of their hometowns, culled either from Roman or local archives. This, of course, presupposes that an antiquarian of even the most enthusiastic local patriotism would have found such a collection edifying, or that any local audience would have – assumptions which are far from certain.

It is, at first sight, striking that the three great antiquarians of the late Republic and early Principate – Aelius Stilo, Terentius Varro, and Verrius Flaccus – are all connected with towns that are heavily represented in our lists : Lanuvium, Reate, and Praeneste. Is there any likelihood that these three men might have been responsible for collections of local prodigies ? There is no evidence for any such collection among the known works of either Aelius Stilo or Verrius Flaccus, although certainly both men were interested in religious antiquities, and Verrius, we know, had read the *Annales Maximi* (9). In the case of Varro (who was born in Reate) we have a good deal more evidence to go on. Among the sixteen books of his *Antiquitates Rerum Diuinarum*, whose titles are listed for us by Augustine (10), were the *De Pontificibus* and the *De Quindecimuiris* ; the latter work, at least, must necessarily have dealt with prodigies. Münzer suggested that a collection of prodigies made by Varro was the direct source for the prodigies in Pliny's *Natural History*, and that Varro's sources, in turn, were Coelius, Sisenna, and Sulla (11). Assuming for the moment that Münzer was correct, if we survey all the Plinian prodigies to see what kind of prodigy collection Varro had provided, we find that, whatever other organizing principle it may have followed, it was not a regional selection (12). Pliny gives few locales for his prodigies but those that he does give are Mutina, Rome, Pompeii, Ameria and Tuder, Tuscus

(9) On Stilo, see M. SCHANZ-C. HOSIUS, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur* i[4] (Munich, 1927), 232 ff. On Verrius, SCHANZ-HOSIUS, *op. cit.*, ii[4], 361 ff. ; SUET., *Gramm.* 17 ; GELLIUS, *NA* 4.5,1.

(10) *CD* 6.4. On Varro, SCHANZ-HOSIUS, *op. cit.*, 555 ff.

(11) F. MÜNZER, *Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (1897), 239 ff., 248.

(12) Pliny retails altogether some twenty-seven prodigies plus five allusions to what are probably expiations for prodigies. They range in date from 217 B.C. to A.D. 43, most falling in the later second century down to the 40's B.C. They are : 2.92, 96, 98-100, 137, 144, 147, 148, 199, 200, 203, 238 ; 3. 123 ; 7. 34, 36, 120 ; 8.221 ; 10.35, 36, 50 ; 16. 132 ; 17. 243, 244 ; 18. 166, 286 ; 28. 12 ; 36. 135.

Sinus, the Aeolian Islands, Casinum, Lanuvium, Ariminum, Nuceria, and Cumae. None is from Sabineland. Despite the fact that Varro discusses the mule breeding industry at Reate, none of the remarkable series of Reatine mule prodigies comes from either Pliny or the *De Re Rustica* (13). Given Varro's sabinophile inclinations, as attested in numerous passages of the *De Lingua Latina*, it is, in fact, a little surprising that none of the prodigies in Pliny, if they do actually derive from a Varronian collection, is located in Sabineland. The only prodigy material which comes directly from an extant work of Varro's are the three versions of the Lacus Curtius legend in *LL* 5.148. There is, in short, no evidence for a collection of Reatine prodigies emanating from Varro. Even if we keep open the possibility that our three antiquarians did collect the prodigies of their *patriae*, we have still accounted for only three of the sixteen 'high-scoring' cities. More important is the difficulty in seeing how such epitomes, by whomever compiled, found their way into the annalistic tradition. Livy, from what we know of his working methods, is not likely to have exerted himself to seek out such material (14). A more likely possibility would be Valerius Antias. But the fact that Antium itself presents only three prodigies (precisely the average number) speaks against this. It seems most unlikely that if Antias were induced to trouble himself to consult and incorporate prodigy collections from other people's *patriae* he would have so neglected his own, given his obvious local patriotism and his unabashed willingness to enhance the importance of the objects of his favor (15).

For most of these high-scoring cities, on the other hand, we can find credible reasons why they may, in fact, have experienced more than their fair share of uncanny events. They include, for example, a number of prestigious pan-Italian cult centers and other places whose major local industry was religion. Such are Lanuvium, the home of Juno Sospita (16) ;

(13) VARRO, *RR* 2.8, 3-6 ; cf. STRABO 5.3,1. On Reate and the mule prodigies, all of which come from Livy or Obsequens, see below, page 14.

(14) On Livy's working methods, see P. G. WALSH, *Livy : His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961), chapter 6 ; on his avoidance of antiquarian sources in general and Varro in particular, see OGILVIE, *Comm.*, 6-7.

(15) OGILVIE, *Comm.*, 16. The three Antiate prodigies occurred in 217, 206, and 203 B.C.

(16) On Lanuvium and the cult of Juno Sospita see A. E. GORDON, *The Cults of Lanuvium*, Univ. of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, II, 2 (1935), 21-58 ; WISSOWA, *RKR*^{2} (1912), 188-189 ; R. E. A. PALMER, *Roman Religion and Roman Empire* (Phila., 1974), 30-32. She was probably the most famous Juno in Latium. CICERO (*Fin.* 2.20, 3) emphasizes Lanuvium's importance as a religious center and local priesthoods are

Praeneste, the home of Fortuna Primigenia (17) ; Aricia, the home of Diana and the famous *rex nemorensis* (18) ; Cumae, the ancient home of the Sibyl and her patron, Apollo – figures of particular importance to the Roman priesthood of the *Decemuiri sacris faciundis* who kept the sibylline books (19) ; Tarracina, a major center for the cult of the widely popular Etrusco-Italic goddess Feronia (20) ; and little Anagnia which, for

better attested there than from any other city in the empire outside of Rome itself. Of Lanuvium's fifteen recorded prodigies, seven directly involve Juno (218, 215, 214, 200, 181, and 99 B.C.).

(17) On Praeneste and Fortuna Primigenia, see G. Radke in *RE* 22.2 (1954) ; Wissowa, *RKR*², 259 ff. ; Cicero, *Diu.* 2. 85-86 ; and A. S. Pease, *Commentary on Cicero's "De Divinatione"*, Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vols. vi and viii (1920, 1923 ; repr. Darmstadt, 1963), *ad loc.* The Praenestine oracle, which involved the typical Italic practice of shaking out wooden lots, was immensely popular, and it is interesting to note that at some point the haruspices had attempted to associate themselves with the foundation legend of the cult (Cic., *Diu.* 2.85-86). While none of the seven recorded prodigies directly involves Fortuna, it is likely, as with the case of Lanuvium and Aricia, that the mere presence of a major cult will have reinforced a predisposition toward religiosity among the inhabitants, to say nothing of the throngs of visitors who were there for the purpose of consulting the oracle. It may also be reasonably suggested that Verrius' dedication of his antiquarian *fasti* there was in response to a genuine interest among the inhabitants in religious antiquities.

(18) On Aricia, see A. E. Gordon, *The Cults of Aricia*, Univ. of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, II, 1 (1934), 1-19. Aricia was the center of an early religious league (Cato, frag. 58). Although none of the six recorded Arician prodigies involves Diana, the town clearly had an ambience in which prodigious things might be expected to occur, and its interest for Romans would assure that a majority of its prodigies be retained by the annalists.

(19) On the Cumaean Sibyl and her grotto, see G. K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton, 1969), 65 ff. Whatever may have been the original function of the extensive subterranean cavern under the west side of the Cumaean acropolis, the Romans had no doubt that it was the Sibyl's grotto. Two of Cumae's seven prodigies involve Apollo (169, 130 B.C.).

(20) On Feronia, see L. R. Taylor, *Local Cults in Etruria*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 2 (1923), 40-55 ; Paul Aebischer, "Le culte de Feronia et la gentilice Feronius", *Rev. Belge de Philol. et d'Hist.*, 13 (1934), 5-23 ; Elizabeth C. Evans, *The Cults of the Sabine Territory*, Papers and Monographs of the American Acad. in Rome, 11 (1939), 155-59 ; J. Heurgon, "Un Ver sacrum etrusque ? Les origines du Lucus Feroniae", In Trois études sur le "Ver sacrum", *Coll. Latomus* 26 (1957), 11-19 ; G. D. B. Jones, "Capena and the Ager Capenas", *PBSR* 30 (1962), 116 ff. In addition, Tarracina's strategic importance in wartime (guarding the Lautulae pass) and large transient population at all times as a convenient stopping place for travellers on their way to or from Capua and the South (Horace, *Sat.* I 5, 25-29) may also very well be factors which would tend to generate a greater than average number of reported supernatural sightings.

reasons wholly unknown, appears to have remained a virtual museum of religious antiquities into the Antonine period (21).

For three other high-scoring cities, we may suggest other reasons for their heavy reporting. Cures Sabini (22), had strong historic and symbolic associations for Romans as the home of Tatius and Numa, and, as was generally believed, the source of the title "Quirites". We cannot explain why the Sabini experience numerous prodigies, but we can readily understand why the Romans took careful note of them ; and, perhaps, the second factor has something to do with the first. Capua records ten prodigies (23) – half of them during the Second Punic War when that city was one of the most politically and militarily troubled places in Italy. If, as will be argued below, prodigies have any relation at all to the level of anxiety in or concerning a city, then these Capuan prodigies find their explanation. The post-war prodigies are not so easily explained, but Capua was a *praefectura* from 211 on, which may have facilitated the reporting of its prodigies to Rome. Capua always loomed large in Roman consciousness and it is likely that its prodigies would have had sufficient interest for Romans such that a fair number of them will have been retained in the annalistic tradition. Reate, which reports ten prodigies, is the only city represented in our lists a majority of whose prodigies can be associated with a well-known feature of the area – namely, the mule breeding industry (24). Six of the ten Reatine prodigies concern mules and one concerns a horse (25). Only three Reatine prodigies are not animal *monstra*. Luterbacher suggested that this was the clearest case (in fact the

(21) As observed by Marcus Aurelius in a letter to Fronto (*Ep.* 4.4).

(22) I make the assumption (following L. R. Taylor, *Voting District of the Roman Republic* [Rome, 1960], 60 ff.) that six prodigies recorded as occurring "in Sabinis" should be referred to the town (or rather, village) of Cures. Other towns in Sabineland (Amiternum, Reate, Eretum, and Trebula Mutuesca) are given separate mention in prodigy reports and so presumably are not to be included under the general term, Sabini. The absence of Cures from the lists would be puzzling unless we assume that *Sabini* denotes it.

(23) 217, 209, 208, 207, 203, 198, 193, 179, 177, and 163 B.C.

(24) Varro, *RR* 2.8, 3-6 ; Strabo 5.3,1.

(25) A mule gave birth in 211 and 190 B.C. ; three-footed mules were reported in 182, 179, and 162 B.C. ; a five-footed mule in 130 B.C. ; and a five-footed horse in 203 B.C. Such prodigies were not confined to Reate. Mules giving birth were also reported from Apulia in 93, in an unspecified place in 83 and in 42 B.C. A three-footed ass was reported from Calatia in 172, and five-footed horses from Rome in 137 and from Bruttium in 199 B.C.

only clear case) of an "örtliche Spezialprodigium" and, despite Rawson's arguments to the contrary, that is still the best explanation (26). The existence of a non-archival epitome of these prodigies is scarcely plausible. Anyone who wishes to argue for a special collection of Reatine mule prodigies ought first to demonstrate why anyone would plausibly make one. One could, perhaps, conceive of some curious naturalist compiling a list of all mule prodigies (though Pliny is the likeliest to have preserved it and he did not). Also conceivable might be a collection of all Reatine prodigies (though Varro, the likeliest one to have done that, did not). But an epitome of all *Reatine* mule prodigies is really rather difficult to believe in. It is an entirely more economical and sensible explanation that this large number of prodigies is a realistic sampling from the archival data. A large population of mules and horses will produce a correspondingly large number of abnormal births, and people whose business it is to breed mules will certainly give keen attention to these. So we may well believe that they were reported with regularity to Rome.

Of the following four cities too little is known of their history or cults which might provide a clue to the causes of their heavy reporting : Amiternum, eight prodigies from 218 to 106 B.C. (27) ; Frusino, seven prodigies from 207 to 147 B.C. ; Formiae, seven prodiges from 269 to 163 B.C. (28) ; and Privernum, six prodiges from 209 to 113 B.C.

The remaining three of the heavily reporting cities – Caere, Veii, and Arretium – must be considered separately in connection with the Etruscan prodigies generally. As has often been noticed, the heavy incidence of prodigy reports from the federate Etruscan cities of Arretium, Perusia, Volsinii, Tarquinii, Faesulae, Volaterrae, and Clusium after 108

(26) Rawson, *art. cit.*, 164.

(27) On what little is known ofAmiternum and its cults, see Evans, *op. cit.*, 103 ff. I can only suggest that the Sabines in general seem to have had a predilection for experiencing prodigies. Three of the sixteen heaviest reporting cities including Amiternum, are Sabine, and Sabineland altogether, with a total of thirty-three prodigy reports, is one of the heaviest reporting areas. Perhaps this is, in part, an aspect of that pristine culture for which the Sabines ultimately became a by-word.

(28) The total of seven prodigies from Formiae includes two which actually occurred at Caieta in 213 and 182 B.C. Caieta was located in the territory of Formiae, and we gather from Livy (40.2, 4 for 182 B.C.) that a prodigy occurring at Caieta would have been reported via the authorities at Formiae.

B.C. is striking (29). Not only do these cities account for nearly all Etruscan prodigies during the period 108 to 91 B.C. (that is, only Caere among the

(29) The following table displays the pattern of distribution :

S. Etruria	Federate Etruria	Roman Colonies in Etruria
218 – Caere		
217 – Caere, Capena, Falerii		
216 – Caere		
210 – Capena	210 – Tarquinii	
208 – Caere	208 – Volsinii	
207 – Veii		
206 – Caere		
198 – Veii	198 – Arretium	
197 – Fregenae		
196 – Capena		
	192 – Arretium	
		176 – Graviscae
174 – Caere, Veii		
173 – Veii		
		172 – Saturnia
169 – Veii		
166 – Veii		
163 – Caere		
147 – Caere		
		142 – Luna
		133 – Luna
125 – Veii		
		124 – Saturnia
		117 – Saturnia
	108 – Arretium	
	106 – Perusia	
	104 – Volsinii, Tarquinii	
	(102 – Clusium?)*	
	100 – Tarquinii	
	96 – Faesulae, Arretium	
95 – Caere		
	94 – Faesulae, Volsinii	
	93 – Arretium, Volsinii	
	92 – Volaterrae, Arretium, Faesulae	
	91 – Arretium	
	83 – Clusium	

*Obs. 44 for 102 B.C. reads, in part : *aedes Iouis Clusa fulmine icta* ... For *clusa*, which is not otherwise used by Obsequens as a variant of *clausa*, Heinsius suggested Clusii.

non-federate Etruscan cities reports a prodigy during this period), they also form a very high percentage of all prodigy reports from Italy. They account for somewhat more than 50 percent of all prodigy reports from Italian federates over the whole period of reporting, and nearly 80 percent of all federate prodigy reports in the period 108 to 91 B.C. Their percentage of the prodigy reports from cities of every status, including Rome for the period 108 to 91 is 21 percent, still a strikingly large figure (30).

It is this unusual statistical behavior which led Rawson to posit here also the intrusion of special prodigy collections into the stream of archival transmission in such a way as to distort the data to the point of rendering its meaningless (31).

It is, at the very least, highly likely that our data are incomplete, so that the sharp discontinuity between the romanized and federate Etruscan cities may be more apparent than real. It is certainly impossible to see why, on any theory of the origin of the lists, some special significance should attach to the year 108 B.C. Nevertheless, we are obliged to pursue Rawson's suggestion in detail (which she unfortunately does not) and attempt to satisfy ourselves as best we can on the basis of the existing relevant evidence as to the likelihood that epitomes emphasizing the prodigies from Etruscan cities have distorted our data.

It should be pointed out first that, in addition to the high frequency of reporting from Etruscan cities, other indicators too point to a growing Etruscan component in the total picture of Roman "Prodigienwesen" from the later part of the second century B.C. A tabulation of the frequency of prodigy reports decade by decade over the whole reporting period compared to a tabulation of the relative frequencies of expiations definitely assignable to either haruspices or *decemuiri s.f.* reveals that the period of the 130s through the 90s witnesses simultaneously a sharp rise in overall numbers or prodigy reports comparable to the levels reached during the Second Punic War (32) and, for the first time, a preponderance

(30) These calculations can be derived from the data presented in Appendix B, pp. 107 ff.

(31) RAWSON, *art. cit.*, 164.

(32) Refer to Appendix A, "Summary", p. 106. There is no entirely satisfactory explanation for the overall variation in frequency of prodigy reports for the whole period. One may suggest that the heightened activity of the relevant priesthoods during the Second Punic War generated an institutional momentum which prompted continuing high levels of prodigy reports during subsequent decades down through the 160's – a

of haruspicial over decemviral activity (33). At the same time the bulk of androgynous births and other types of prodigies which can be shown to highly or exclusively appropriate to involvement of haruspices falls in this period (34). Do these several categories of data combine to produce an accurate reflection of a real situation (whatever may be its cause), or are they, rather, evidence of a deep source bias which has skewed the true distribution of reporting locales and haruspicial activity out of all recognition ?

Whereas in our consideration of the sixteen heavily reporting cities we found no evidence for the kind of local epitomes which would be required to produce an overrepresentation of them in the prodigy lists, the situation with respect to the Etruscan cities and haruspices generally might appear different. Here we know that Etruscan *ostentaria* and thunder calendars

period which was, generally speaking expansive, successful, and untroubled. The decline in reporting in the 150's and 140's may then be ascribed to a gradual loss of this momentum in the face of continuing success and prosperity, and, perhaps, to a degree, in the face of growing rationalism among the upper classes (although this factor is often exaggerated in discussions of Roman religion). Note that the fall-off after the 160's is not simply attributable to the loss of Livy after 167. The 160's themselves area fairly heavily reported decade and half of these reports come from Obsequens after the point where Livy breaks off. Obsequens is our primary source both for the sparsely reported 150's and 140's and for the much more heavily reported period of the 130's through the 90's when the declining interest in prodigies appears to reverse itself.

(33) Refer to Appendix A, "Summary", p. 106.

(34) Refer to Appendix E for a summary of the known instances of androgyne prodigies. Note that the observed rise in activity of haruspices is contingent, in part, on the frequency of androgynes during this period, but not entirely so. Androgyne expiations involved haruspices and *decemuiri* jointly ; outside this category of prodigy haruspices appear on from ten to eighteen occasions compared with five to nine occasions for *decemuiri* during the same period (refer to Appendix A).

A prodigy is considered, empirically, to be characteristic of haruspices if they expiate it on most of the occasions for which we are clearly told who the expiating or consulting priesthood was – which is by no means true of all, or even most instances of any prodigy. Our empirical evidence is, however, consonant with what we are told in the sources about the kinds of things that haruspices usually do (refer to Appendix D). Of the several kinds of prodigies which appear to be particularly "haruspicial" most have a majority of their instances in the period from the 130's on. Specifically : talking infants, four of six ; *fremitus*, seven of seven ; swarms of bees, six of nine ; flames from the earth, three of four ; statues struck by lightning, seven of twelve ; monstrous human births (other than androgynes), thirteen of twenty-six.

Note, finally, that the rise in reports from Etruscan cities and the rise in haruspicial activity in this period are complementary, not tautological, data since haruspices cannot, in fact, be shown to have consulted on more than a few of those Etruscan prodigies (cf. OBS. 27, 43, 44, and 53 for the possible instances, some less certain than others).

circulated in Rome in the last century B.C. – the products of a number of enthusiastic students of the *Etrusca disciplina* who translated and adapted them for a Roman audience. The few surviving fragments of this literature, however, indicate collections of *types* of prodigies which, whenever they occur, or if they occur on a certain day of the year, portend some specific outcome. They are not collections of specific prodigies noted as having actually occurred on particular occasions. And it would seem that it can only be collections such as this – bringing together large batches of prodigies for which haruspices had been consulted on particular occasions, and perhaps (though by no means necessarily) emphasizing prodigies from Etruscan cities more than from elsewhere – which might be suspected of constituting a source of distortion in the lists (35).

Two sources, however, Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* and a passage in Cicero's *De Diuinatione*, may be thought to reveal the existence of this sort of prodigy collection. Pliny does, at least, claim to have read all of the late Republican haruspicial antiquarians who could conceivably have transmitted the kind of collection with which we are concerned, and his long digression on haruspicial lightning lore (*NH* 2.138-144) certainly comes ultimately from one of these writers. But of all Pliny's prodigies only four show much likelihood of deriving from a haruspicial source : 2.199 for 91 B.C., an earth-quake in the Ager Mutiniensis of which Pliny says, *Etruscae disciplinae uoluminibus inuenio* (his only use of such a

(35) Reference is to the *Ephemeris Brontoskopia* of Nigidius Figulus, preserved in Johannes Lydus, *de Ost.* c. 27-28 W. (on which see A. Piganiol, "Sur le calendrier brontoscopique de Nigidius Figulus", in *Studies in Roman Social and Economic History in Honor of Alan Chester Johnson* [1951], 79-87 and W. V. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* [Oxford, 1971], 5 ff.) ; and to similar calendars also in Lydus (*Ost.* 88, 13 ; 99, 17) which may be attributable to Nigidius and to C. Fonteius Capito (as argued by Weinstock in *PBSR* 18 [1950], 44-49 and 19 [1951], 139-140). Tarquitius Priscus, who was perhaps the chief propagator of the *disciplina* at Rome translated *ostentaria* cited by Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.7,2 and 20,3) and is one of those listed by Pliny in the tables of contents to Books ii and xi of the *Naturalis Historia*. On Tarquitius see, J. Heurgon in *Latomus* 12 (1953), 402-417. Aulus Caecina of Volaterrae is the source for sections on lightning lore in Seneca (*Quaest. Nat.* 29-56) and Pliny (2. 137-148), and may also be the source for haruspicial lore contained in the *De Diuinatione* of his friend, Cicero. The possible contents of other putative Etruscan archives, such as the *Tuscae Historiae* mentioned by Varro (*ap* Censorinus, 17,6), remain a mystery despite the conjectures of Heurgon (*Daily Life of the Etruscans* [New York, 1964], 247 ff.). This is not to say that I wish to argue in principle against the existence of extensive lists of documented prodigies (cf. T. J. Cornell, "Etruscan Historiography", *Annali di Pisa*, ser. III, 6 [1976], 432 ff.).

phrase); 2.144 for 115 B.C., lightning striking the temple of Juno in Rome which is mentioned at the end of the long discussion of fulgural lore; 7.36 for 171 B.C., a girl changed into a boy at Casinum who was by order of the haruspices deported to a desert island (of this prodigy Pliny says, *inuenio in annalibus*); 8.221 for 91/90 B.C., mice foretelling the war with the Marsians by gnawing the silver shields at Lanuvium (here Pliny gives no indication of the expiation but this prodigy certainly matches one found in Cicero, *Diu.* 1.99, and attributed there to the history of Cornelius Sisenna according to whom it was viewed by the haruspices as *tristissimum*).

The existence of a haruspicial source for a handful of prodigies in Pliny, even if we could be certain of it (36), is in itself of no importance for any conclusions which are derived mainly from the major, continuous and presumably archival source represented by Livy/Obsequens unless Pliny's source can be detected behind Livy/Obsequens as well. In fact, none of the four prodigies just noted can be found in Livy/Obsequens except possibly the first if that finds an echo in Obs. 54 for 91 B.C., *circa Regium terrae motu pars urbis murique diruta*, on the supposition that Regium is not the Greek city in Bruttium but Regium Lepidi in Aemilia not many miles from Mutina. We should have, then, two quite different versions of the same prodigy (a widespread seismic event in the region of Aemilia effecting several towns at once ?), but if a haruspicial account is thought to be the source of Pliny's version then it cannot also be the source of Pliny's variant (37).

(36) The influence of a decemviral epitome on Pliny is, in fact, more demonstrable than that of a haruspicial one, despite the prominence of Etruscan authors in his tables of sources. Five Plinian passages (3.123; 7.120; 17.243; 18.286; and 28.12) make specific references to Sibylline pronouncements or decemviral ceremonies, and perhaps derive from Varro's *De Quindecenuiris*.

(37) To throw our net as wide as possible, we may add two less likely items. In 16.132, dated to *Cimbricis bellis*, Pliny cites, as an exemple of a tree falling down without a storm or other natural cause, an *ostentum* which occurred at Nuceria in the grove of Juno when an elm tree fell over. Its branches were lopped off but it then righted itself and flowered, *a quo deinde tempore maiestas populi Romani resurrexit quae ante uastata cladibus fuerat.* This equals Obs. 43 for 104 B.C.: *Nuceriae ulmus uento euersa sua sponte erecta in radicem conualuit.* Clearly it is the same prodigy but with noticeable differences in detail between the two versions. Pliny implies that the tree was not blown down by the wind, where Obsequens says that it was. Pliny speaks of it flowering again, Obsequens of its taking root. The favorable interpretation placed upon the prodigy with respect to the *maiestas* of the Roman people, might well reflect an interpretation given at the time, and, in that case, most likely by haruspices – favorable interpretations being characteristic of

Cicero at *Diu.* 1.97-98 retails a list of twenty prodigies which looks very much to be in origin a product of haruspicial apologetic designed to vindicate the reliability of haruspicial *responsa* by reference to Sibylline oracles delivered on the same occasions (38). There are, in fact, numerous occasions in our sources on which both haruspices and *decemuiri* were summoned by the senate to offer opinions on the same prodigy (although some kinds of prodigies, on the other hand, seem always to have activated only one group or the other). It is encouraging to observe that Cicero's list commits no obvious error in this respect (39). Although all of the prodigies are undated and eleven are given without locales, it may be that this list constitutes (or at least reflects) the only haruspicial epitome of particular prodigies which we can study. Further, if, as seems likely, Cicero's immediate source for the list was the history of Cornelius Sisenna (a writer of Etruscan extraction and, according to Cicero, a believer in prodigies) and if Sisenna was, as well, a major source for the later decades of Livy's history, then we have perhaps found not only the sort of epitome whose existence Rawson suggested but a plausible avenue of transmission through which it (and other compilations like it) can have exerted a distorting effect on the lists in Livy/Obsequens (40). Comparison reveals that Cicero's list relates to the lists in Obsequens in an interesting way.

them. If this should suggest a haruspicial source for Pliny's version, then again Obsequens' variant hardly derives directly from the same source. PLINY 2. 137 for 63 B.C., *in Catalinariis prodigiis Pompeiano ex municipio M. Herennius decurio sereno die fulmine ictus est*, equals OBSEQUENS 61 for this year : *sereno Vargunteius Pompeiis de caelo exanimatus*. Individuals struck by lightning is a prodigy type which is fairly, though not exclusively, characteristic of haruspices. But the discrepancy in the man's name would suggest that here, too, if Pliny's version is haruspicial, Obsequens' is not.

(38) ... *inque his omnibus responsa haruspicum cum Sibyllae uersibus congruebant* ... *nonne et haruspices ea responderunt quae euenerunt et in Sibyllae libris eaedem repertae praedictiones sunt ?* Quite apart from the question we are considering at the moment, the list is interesting simply as an instance of a certain kind of haruspicial apologetic and will claim our attention again below in that regard. I have found no discussion of the character or structure of the list in PEASE's *Commentary* on the *De Diu.*, or elsewhere.

(39) Collaboration was regular in the case of androgynes, which are noted on the list. Lightning prodigies (also on the list) can be shown to have been procurated by both groups at different times. Not on the list are, for example, pestilences (only procurated by *decemuiri* as far as we know), or human *monstra*, excluding androgynes, and swarms of bees (procurated only by haruspices).

(40) Wülker suggested Sisenna as the source for Cicero's list (*op. cit.*, 81). Immediately following the list, Cicero appends five more prodigies which are explicitly from Sisenna's history. Cicero says of Sisenna (*Diu.* 1.99), *contra ostenta nihil disputat*. On Sisenna as a source for Livy, see WALSH, *op. cit.*, 136.

Whereas we found no striking similarity between any of Pliny's "haruspicial" prodigies and those of Obsequens, we detect in Cicero's list a close connection indeed. In fact, fully half of the twenty prodigies on the list can be located with some likelihood in just two annual entries in Obsequens – 36 for 117 B.C. and 54 for 91 B.C. (41). What shall we make of this ? Alternative explanations are, perhaps, imaginable, but I suggest that the most economical one is that the author of Cicero's list compiled it from other lists – that is to say, not from lists of types of prodigies, or of those from a particular area or city, but from *year* lists ; in fact, from precisely the lists which, in incomplete and sketchy form, we still see in Obsequens' yearly entries. It is reasonable to suppose that the compiler of Cicero's list perused annual lists of prodigies (which, in their original

(41) If, as seems very probable, Cicero's number 7 (*delata etiam ad senatum labe agri Priuernatis cum ad infinitam altitudinem terra desedisset*) equals Obs. 36 (*Priuerni terra septem iugerum spatio in cauerna desedit*), then three other prodigies given by Obsequens for that year can also be related to items on Cicero's list (Obs. : *fulmine Romae et circa pleraque tacta*-Cicero : *in Auentino portae et homines de caelo tacti* ; Obs. : *Praeneste lacte pluit* = Cic. : *quondam etiam lactis imber affluxit* ; Obs. : *Saturniae androgynus annorum decem inuentus* = Cic. : *ortus androgyni*). The only remaining prodigy in Obsequens notice for this year, *hastae Martis in Regia motae*, quite properly does not occur in Cicero's list (we are told by Gellius [*NA* 4.6,1-2] that this prodigy, of which there are several recorded instances, was always procurated by the pontiffs).

Number 20 on Cicero's list (*Romaeque Pietatis de caelo tacta*) is certainly to be equated with Obs. 54 (*aedes Pietatis in circo Flaminio clausa fulmine icta*), there being no other known instance of this temple having been struck by lightning. In that case, three other prodigies in Obsequens entry for that year can be related to items on Cicero's list (*viz.* Obs. : *in Spoletino colore aureo globus ignis ad terram deuolutus* = Cic. : *cum caelum discessisse uisum est atque in eo animaduersi globi* ; Obs. : *Cumis in arce simulacrum Apollinis sudauit* = Cic. : *cum Cumis Apollo sudauit* ; Obs. : *in Vestinis per dies septem lapidibus testisque pluit* = Cic. : *cum saepe lapidum* [*imber affluxit*]). Further, Cicero's reference to *ortus androgyni*, may be located not only in Obsequens' list for 117 B.C. but may be equated as well with an androgyne mentioned by Diodorus, dated to the outset of the Marsian War (that is, 91 B.C., the date of Obs. 54). Finally, Cicero's item, *fluuius Atratus sanguine fluxit*, could be an instance of the general allusion *sanguinem fluxisse*, given by Sisenna (via Cicero) and dated to *initio Marsici belli* (again, the date of Obs. 54). As above, the remaining items given by Obsequens and Sisenna are quite properly excluded from Cicero's list as they are not likely to have been procurated by both priesthoods – viz. mysterious voices predicting danger, mice gnawing the shields at Lanuvium (from Sisenna), bloody loaves of bread at Arretium, flames shooting from the earth at Aenaria, and an earthquake at Regium (from Obsequens). In all five cases we may be certain that the haruspices alone were involved.

The remaining ten items on Cicero's list either occur nowhere else in our sources (e.g. *Tusculi aedes Castoris et Pollucis de caelo tacta*) or occur numerous times (e.g. *faces in caelo uisae*).

form, were certainly far more full and explicit as to the activity of the different priesthoods than the form in which we now have them) noting down just those prodigies which the senate had referred to both priesthoods and rejecting any which did not meet this criterion. The compiler probably did not have to consult many annual lists altogether to account for every item on Cicero's list – although we cannot now demonstrate this from the remains of what Obsequens has left us. Quite likely the list could have been extended if the compiler had wished to make it exhaustive ; there are numerous types of prodigies not mentioned which might very well have been handled by both priesthoods on at least one occasion. This document, then, would seem to have been derived from the same annually ordered archival source as were the lists transmitted through the annalistic process. It is a product of, rather than an influence on, the Roman annalistic record. The burden of proof will properly remain on those who wish to see the lists in Livy/Obsequens as heavily distorted by the influence of special epitomes. Such a contention seems not demonstrable from any of the available evidence.

Such distortion as may exist will be the result of a gradual process of attrition in which an unknown number of prodiges from little-known places was eliminated by the annalists as being of no interest to their readers (although many such minor places are still represented in our lists by one or two prodigies). At the same time there will have operated a contrary process in which a larger percentage of the prodigies of a few places which, in fact, experienced more than their fair share of such phenomena, was retained because these places were of interest to Romans. We cannot, of course, precisely assess the degree of distortion of this kind which may be operating, as we have no idea how much of the original archival data we are lacking – data which might have had the effect of leveling out to some extent the apparent peaks and valleys in the distributional patterns as they now appear. But we can, I think, feel confident that such distortion as there may be will have the effect of exaggerating, but cannot run contrary to, the factual situation.

The same holds true in the case of the haruspices. The fact that the *Etrusca disciplina* enjoyed great attention in late Republican Rome, leading to the circulation of the kinds of documents that we have been considering, bespeaks, in itself, a heightened activity and consequently heightened interest in them. This increase in haruspicial activity may certainly be owing in part to the influence of general cultural trends and a

growing appeal of religious esoterica (42). But this general explanation does not account well for the bulk of their activity during this period, which still involves, for the most part, traditional prodigy types (e.g. human and animal *monstra* and seismic events) and traditional expiatory responses (removal of the *monstrum*, lustration, etc.) which are demonstrable from an early period and which do not draw upon the "new occultism" in any way. Nor does this general explanation seem to account well for the sudden sharp rise in haruspicial activity and in the reporting of prodigies from Etruscan cities precisely in the period from the Gracchi through the Social War. It remains to consider the possibility, then, that this phenomenon is a reaction to a political situation. This hypothesis will require first a general demonstration of the thesis that acceptance of prodigies from Italian cities and the employment of the haruspices by the senate did, in fact, function as a signalling system with distinctly political overtones.

(42) This is well brought out by Raymond BLOCH, *Les prodiges dans l'antiquité classique* (Paris, 1963), 129 ff., who argues that the ancient Roman conception of the prodigy as an inevitably dire sign of the rupture of the *pax deorum* began to change under the pressures of the Second Punic War and through the increasing Hellenization of Roman religion into a conception of the prodigy as a presage for the future. This new conception allowed greater scope to haruspices, whose native doctrine allowed them to answer the question, *quid prodigium portendit* ? Stefan Weinstock (see n. 35, above) has shown how Etruscan fulgural lore modified itself by the incorporation of elements of Chaldaean astrology through the desire of haruspices to satisfy the growing Roman taste for astrology and other forms of occultism in the late Republic.

II. THE PEREGRINE PRODIGIES

The integrity of the prodigy lists has been assailed ever since Mommsen on the grounds that they contain a large number of entries from Italian communities which were of peregrine status before the Social War. To be precise, we have prodigy notices (dated earlier than the war) from eleven Latin colonies, from a minimum of sixteen federate allies whose juridical status is reasonably certain (with an additional fifteen less certain possibilities) and from several strictly extra-Italian areas – Cisalpine Gaul, Sicily, Sardinia (some occurring among Roman troops but others, most of the Sicilian ones, occurring among civilians). Altogether, peregrine prodigy notices account for 28 percent of all known prodigy locales and 21 percent of all prodigy reports exclusive of those from the city of Rome itself (43).

Since it has so long been an article of faith (though unsupported by the explicit testimony of any ancient source) that pontifical law could not have permitted the recognition as Roman *prodigia publica* of events which occurred outside the *ager Romanus*, these data have continued to be an embarrassment. Mommsen himself suggested a number of make-shift explanations to account for them – in particular, that such prodigies may have occurred in every case on patches of Roman *ager publicus* and that prodigies could thus be used actually to locate such areas. But neither this explanation nor any of the others will do. A number of these prodigies occur within the confines of the town – hardly *ager publicus* ; or at a period prior to the earliest possibility of *ager publicus* having been taken from the town's territory ; nor are they, for the most part, particularly terrifying or bizarre compared with the usual run of such things from Roman areas such as to justify an occasional bending of the rules, as Mommsen also suggested (44).

(43) Refer to Appendix B, p. 107 ff., below.

(44) MOMMSEN first clearly enunciated the view in his *Epistula de Romanorum Prodigiis ad Ottonem Jahnium* (*Gesam. Schr.* vol. 7, [1912], 168) that prodigies could have been accepted and expiated as *prodigia publica* only if they occurred on the *ager publicus p. R.* – that is, public buildings and other non-privately owned land within citizen tribal

Rawson, while properly rejecting these earlier attempts to excuse the data, ends her discussion by opting for what is, indeed, the only possible conclusion other than the one that I wish to advance. That is, that these notices are entirely spurious, concocted "from a number of sources varying in character and origin" after the Social War when distinctions between *ager Romanus* and *peregrinus* had ceased to exist ; place names – some Roman some peregrine – and dates were freely assigned to stereotyped miracles by historians who intended the prodigies to serve only as literary *topoi* in the style of dramatic hellenistic history. If Rawson's view is followed, then the conclusion which she draws must be accepted : any body of data twenty-five percent of which is spurious is so compromised as to be useless for study (45).

But it may appear, on the contrary, that it is precisely this twenty-five percent of the data which rewards study and which takes on significance within a general view of the political uses of the prodigies.

There is, first of all, simply no doubt that at least by the time of the Second Punic War the Pontiffs could permit themselves to respond to religious events outside the *ager Romanus* (taking that to mean, by its widest possible extension, all juridically Roman tribal and public land). They did so in response to the sacrilege committed by a Roman officer against Persephone in the federate city of Locri in 204 B.C. On that occasion they prescribed expiatory rites to be performed by a senatorial legation in Locri. The sacrilege against Persephone was not accompanied by a prodigy, though it might well have been. But this is fortunate for our purposes because it removes the event from any possibly contaminated prodigy list. It rests securely in Livy's narrative (46). A further point against Rawson's view is the observation that most of the peregrine prodigies are accompanied by references to expiations which are accurate

territory, the territories of the Roman coastal colonies, and other parcels of *ager publicus* throughout Italy ; and that peregrine prodigies, therefore, (as well as those occurring on privately owned citizen land), must be considered spurious, or, at least, anomalous. This view, so far as I am aware, has been universally maintained by students of Roman religion.

(45) Rawson, *art. cit.*, 162.

(46) Livy 29.8, 16-21 ; a similar act occurred again four years later and pontifical expiation was again contemplated (Livy 31. 12-13). We should compare the senatorial *legati* of 204 with the *legatio senatus* which was sent to expiate the seismic disturbance in the Liparis during the Social War and perhaps also in 126 B.C. (Pliny, *NH* 2.238 and 203 ; Strabo 6.2, 1 ; Obs. 29 ; Oros. 5.10).

and believable and, for the most part, standard and colorless – hardly the stuff, one would suppose, of dramatic *topoi* (47).

Mommsen's argument against the normal acceptability of peregrine prodigies rests on inferences drawn from several passages, only one of which is decisive.

First is a rescript of Constantine of 322 A.D. (*Cod. Theod.* 16.10.1) : *si quid de palatio nostro aut ceteris operibus publicis degustatum fulgore esse constiterit ; retento more ueteris obseruantiae quid portendat ab haruspicibus requiratur.* Despite the reference to "ancient observance" this is hardly evidence for religious distinctions between *publicus* and *priuatus*, still less for *Romanus* and *peregrinus*, applicable in the Republic. Naturally, the State was concerned when public buildings were struck by lightning, but no rule that only such instances were of concern to the State could be extracted from this rescript.

Second, a passage from Livy, 45. 16,5 for 167 B.C., tells us that *Calatiae in agro publico* a Roman citizen, M. Valerius, announced that his hearth flowed with blood. But neither this passage nor the one other reference to a prodigy occurring on *ager publicus* (Livy 31.12,7 : *Lucanis in agro publico ...*, overlooked by Mommsen) will yield a rule that only prodigies on *ager publicus* could be expiated by the state. We cannot say what the significance may be (if any) of the specification of *ager publicus* in the prodigy notices. It seems, on the whole, most likely that it was simply a matter of course to mention that a place was *in agro publico* if this happened to be the case (48). It probably, in fact, was not the case very often since most *ager publicus*, at least most of that which was created in southern Italy after the Second Punic War, was sparsely inhabited grazing land and we should not expect many prodigies to have been reported from such areas. It should be stressed in any case that *ager publicus* is not a religious term. We should expect *ager Romanus* (assuming that that term had come to embrace all juridically Roman land) if the point were to label the place in question as acceptable from a religious point of view (49).

(47) In the few cases of reported prodigies which can be claimed with some likelihood to be literary fabrications, such as, for example, the list given by Orosius for 223 B.C., which is pretty clearly aimed at the sacrilegious C. Flaminius, or Coelius Antipater's account of the earthquakes accompanying the battle of Lake Trasimene (LIVY, 22.5), there is no indication of expiation and none is expected.

(48) Cf. LIVY, 34.45, 6 (194 B.C.) : *Hadriani nuntiauerunt in agro suo lapidibus pluuisse.*

(49) Cf. VARRO, *LL*, 5.33 for the five kinds of *agri* (*Romanus, Gabinus, peregrinus*

Finally, the decisive passage. Livy tells us that in 169 B.C. a prodigy reported from the Latin colony of Fregellae – that in the house of one L. Atreius a spear burned for two hours without being consumed – was rejected by the Senate because it had occurred *in loco peregrino* (50).

To account for this episode, it is necessary to view it in a broader context. If, as I wish to argue, the gradual acceptance of non-Roman prodigies by the Roman Senate constituted a political act whose purpose was to assert the religious unity of Italy and Rome's central place in that unity by her undertaking – indeed insisting upon – the duty to expiate Italian prodigies, and thus to heal the *pax deorum* on behalf of all, thereby intentionally blurring the religious distinction between Roman and non-Roman land, then, by the same token, the rejection of a peregrine prodigy might, in different circumstances, suggest itself as a means of signalling that the town in question was indeed foreign and beyond the pale. Here the case of Fregellae finds its explanation.

We have notices of two earlier prodigies from that city, dating to the Second Punic War which, so far as we are told, were expiated without hesitation (51). But in the decades following the war Fregellae emerged as one of the worst offenders among those Latin colonies whose citizens were migrating to Rome in large numbers and there falsely claiming Roman citizenship. Latins were expelled from Rome at the request of their own *patriae* in 187 and 177 B.C. On the latter occasion we are told that representatives of the Samnites and Paeligni complained at Rome specifically about Fregellae – that four thousand of their citizens had migrated there, presumably to fill the place of an equally large number of Fregellans who had migrated to Rome. It appears that Fregellae was becoming virtually an Oscan city (52). In this connection it seems

hosticus, and *incertus*) which Roman augurs distinguished for certain ritual purposes, and discussion in Mommsen, *StR*, 3.1.824 ff. and Kubitschek, *RE*, 1 (1894), "Ager", 781 ff.

(50) Livy, 43.13, 6 for 169 B.C. In this passage, after listing eight prodigies which were expiated with full-grown victims and *supplicatio* by order of the *decemuiri*, Livy says : *duo non suscepta prodigia sunt, alterum quod in priuato loco factum esset, – palmam enatam in inpluuio suo T. Marcius Figulus nuntiabat –, alterum quod in loco peregrino : Fregellis in domo L. Atrei hasta, quam filio militi emerat, interdiu plus duas horas arsisse, ita ut nihil eius amburerct ignis, dicebatur.*

(51) Livy, 26.23, 4-6 (211 B.C.) : *Murum portasque de caelo tactas* ; 28.11, 1-7 (206 B.C.) : *nocte lucem obortam.*

(52) Livy, 39.3 ; 41.8, 6-8. This point is stressed by E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge, 1967), 318. On the subject in general see A. H. MacDonald, "The History of Rome and Italy in the Second Century B.C.", *The Cambridge Historical*

significant, then, that out of all the regions of Italy from which prodigies are ever reported by far the fewest come from Samnium and the Oscan hill peoples of east-central Italy, the peoples who were one day to fight the Social War with Rome (53). Roman-Oscan antipathy had a long history and Rome seems seldom to have been willing to communicate a sense of commonality with them through acknowledgement of their prodigies or in any other way.

Latins who still remained illegally in the city in 173 were ordered by the consul of that year, L. Postumius Albinus, and by his brother Aulus, who was one of the Censors, to leave Rome and be counted in their local census. Aulus the censor was also a *decemuir* and in 169 it was the *decemuiri* who expiated those prodigies which were accepted and who were undoubtedly therefore consulted on the rejection of the prodigy from Fregellae (54).

No other prodigy from the city is recorded until years later when it was no longer a *respublica* but had been reduced to the status of Roman public property (55). It need hardly be added that that change in status occurred as a result of its abortive rebellion and annihilation by the Romans in 125 B.C. (56). Fregellae, then, was not just any Latin colony and the rejection of its prodigy in 169 is far more likely to be a unique revival for political reasons of what may well have been a genuine archaic distinction though one which had not been applied for perhaps a century.

In fact, Livy's notice for 169 provides us with still another apparently unique example of the revival of an obsolete prohibition in the acceptance of prodigies to serve a particular purpose. Coupled with the notice of the

Journal, 6 (1938), 125-146 ; E. T. SALMON, *Roman Colonization from the Second Punic War to the Gracchi*", *JRS*, 26 (1936), 47-67 ; A. J. TOYNBEE, *Hannibal's Legacy* (London, 1965), II, 137 ff.

(53) Refer to Appendix C, p. 114 f., below. The Oscan hill region is the least represented area of Italy which is at no great distance from Rome ; it constitutes a striking anomaly in the overall pattern of frequency of reports as a function of distance from the capital.

(54) LIVY, 42.10. On the relation of the consul to the censor, see the stemma of the Postumii in *RE*, 22.1, 915-916. Aulus joined the priesthood in 173 B.C. (LIVY, 42.10, 6). He was still alive in 169 – his last recorded act was in 167 (see *RE*, 22.1, "Postumius", no. 46).

No Latin colony had attempted to report a prodigy since 194 B.C. (Ariminum), nor does another appear until 135 B.C. (Bononia).

(55) OBS., 52 for 93 B.C.

(56) E. T. SALMON, *Roman Colonization under the Republic* (Ithaca, 1970), 117 ; E. BADIAN, *Foreign Clientelae* (Oxford, 1958), 176 ff.

rejection of the Fregellan prodigy is the rejection of the prodigy reported to T. Marcius Figulus on the grounds that it occurred *in loco priuato*. A distinction between prodigies on public and private Roman land is also likely to be genuine and old. But this distinction also had clearly been allowed to lapse since at latest 209 B.C. when the first monstrous human births are recorded in our lists (57). Monstrous animals may all have been born on public pasture land but surely human *monstra* are born at home – *in loco priuato* ; and from 209 on large numbers of them occur in our lists. The authenticity of this species of prodigy in general has never been questioned. Indeed, most "private" prodigies probably continued to be rejected out of hand either because they were trivial or because they were not vouched for by a sufficient number of reliable witnesses – but not because they were private. That distinction cannot have been maintained in practice, and when private prodigies were not trivial and the visible evidence was incontestable (as in the case of monstrous births) they were certainly expiated. The term *prodigium publicum* has by the Second Punic War, if not earlier, come to mean any prodigy which the Senate chooses to acknowledge.

Marcius' prodigy and its rejection is a clear case of politics, as Münzer noticed long ago (58). The miraculous appearance of a palm tree – the symbol of victory – in the home of a Marcius was surely intended to influence the impending assignment of commands in the war against Perseus for which there was fierce competition (59). In the event, two Marcii, consul and praetor, were given the command, but their prodigy, because it was patently faked, was rejected – politely, through the invocation of an obsolete religious technicality.

The rejection of these two prodigies in 169 did not, of course, entail a permanent revival of these prohibitions, as it was not intended to do. A

(57) Livy, 27.11, 1-6 : an androgyne and a boy with an elephant's head, both reported from the Roman colony of Sinuessa.

(58) Fr. Münzer, in *RE*, 14.2, 1560, "Marcius", no. 65 (1930) ; cf. H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics* : 220 to 150 B.C., 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1973), 203 and n. 2. In his brief notice on Titus Marcius, Münzer did not generalize from the episode, which he correctly analyzes, to its relevance for the problem we are concerned with here.

(59) Livy, 43.14-15. The attempt by the Marcii to claim a palm tree of their own was undoubtedly inspired by the fact that the senate was in process of accepting one or perhaps two other prodigious palm trees that year ; Livy, 43.13, 5 – a palm tree was reported growing in the courtyard of the temple of Fortuna Primigenia ; and Piso, frag. 38 (in Pliny, *NH*, 17.244) – a palm tree portending victory and triumphs grew in the temple of Capitoline Jupiter *bello Persei*.

Latin colony appears in our lists again in 135 B.C. Prodigies from other federate cities begin to be reported again from at least 166 B.C., and in that same year also there is recorded an abnormal birth – undoubtedly *in loco priuato* (60).

Livy's source for these *prodigia non suscepta* is presumably not archival. For the Fregellan prodigy, at any rate, we may suggest the annalist A. Postumius Albinus, son of the censor and *decemuir* who played a major role in that "cause célèbre". But whatever his source may have been, we are tempted to ask why Livy retails these oddities whose true import he apparently does not understand. Perhaps for no reason that we can identify, but it is worth observing that his prodigy list for this year follows immediately on his famous remarks at 43.13,1-2 in which he justifies his attention to the prodigies because *mihi uetustas res scribenti nescio quo pacto anticus fit animus et quaedam religio tenet* ... We should expect after this introduction some particularly striking list, but what follows differs in no way from dozens of others which he has given before, and is less dramatic than many of them. The best that Livy could do to illustrate that punctilious *religio* that so impressed him was to include our two unique references to religious discriminations that had the ring of antiquity about them; omitting to mention (if he even appreciated the fact) that they were already anachronistic at the time.

We have now to note some positive indication (not amounting to proof but, I think, suggestive) for the hypothesis within which we have discussed the Fregellan episode : namely, that the sphere of acceptability of prodigies (originally no doubt confined to a religiously defined *ager Romanus*) was broadened over a period of time as a conscious political gesture. There is, to be sure, no explicit evidence that such a process was ever contemplated, but if we were to conceive a series of steps by which a genuine old distinction was gradually abandoned for pressing political reasons, we might plausibly suggest that the sphere of acceptability should first be extended to embrace Latins, who were closest to the Romans in race, law, and religion ; then to include other federate allies within Italy ; and finally some provincial areas outside Italy though at no great distance from it. But this is precisely the series of steps which our data, woefully incomplete as they are, reveal. The earliest peregrine prodigy notice in our

(60) Bononia in Obs., 26 for 135 B.C. Obs., 12 for 166 B.C. records a prodigy from Praeneste and a human *monstrum* from Teanum.

sources (from Orosius, but ultimately from Livy) comes from the Latin colony of Cales in 269 B.C. ([61]). I do not wish to suggest that this is the precise date at which Latin prodigies first became acceptable. Rather, because of its proximity in time to the Pyrrhic war, I do suggest that it was in the course of that first foreign onslaught against the Roman confederacy that a unifying response was made, and the first step in widening the sphere of acceptability taken. But the great watershed in the process was certainly the Second Punic War. The burst of religious innovation in general, and in particular the overall rise in the numbers of prodigies and in the elaborateness of expiations in response to Hannibal's invasion are facts too familiar to need mention. Certainly the increase in prodigy sightings is fundamentally explicable as individual response to anxiety. (It is not necessary to suggest here or elsewhere that the senate or individual priesthoods ever as a matter of course encouraged fictitious prodigy reports). But what does call for comment is that only now – and within four years of the beginning of the war – every other category of non-Roman place, in sequence, is heard from in the prodigy lists. In 217 Praeneste and Arpi report the first prodigies from non-colonial allies. In the same year prodigies are reported from Roman military encampments across the water in Sicily and Sardinia. In 214 are reported the first of many prodigies from civilian Sicily ([62]). In the face of Hannibal's explicit threat to the integrity of Rome's Italian confederacy the threatened organism responds by symbolically asserting its oneness.

If we ask what body of Roman statesmen in particular advocated this policy, the answer is surely the *decemuiri sacris faciundis*, the keepers of the Sibylline Books and the chief (though not the only) authorities on the procuration of prodigies. From their earliest recorded acts this priesthood had maintained a tradition of progressive and pragmatic religious innovation, of attention to plebeian religious sensibilities, and, in particular, of openness to the religion of non-Romans (it was almost entirely through their agency that foreign deities and ritual entered Roman cult). They alone, so far as our records go, expiated (and, therefore, advised on the admisibility of) all those first peregrine prodigies which occurred in the early years of the war ([63]).

(61) Orosius, 4.4, 1-4 – flames shot from the earth in the *ager* Calenus.

(62) Refer to Appendix B, p. 111, below.

(63) The college became, in 368 B.C., the first of the Roman priesthoods to admit plebeians when its membership was raised from two to ten. Reorganization of the college

It appears, however, that the inclusion of significant foreign prodigy locales within the sphere of acceptability did not offer great flexibility as a propaganda device. Assuming, as I think we must, that prodigy reporting was always a legitimately spontaneous phenomenon, the Senate could only acknowledge prodigies that were reported to it (64). At all times the prime variable in the reporting of prodigies was simply distance from the capital. The bulk of our reports comes from the central contiguous area of Latium, Campania, Sabineland, and southern Etruria – all largely Roman citizen territory. This pattern holds with little variation (except for the rise in reporting of northern Etruria later on) before, during, and after the Punic War (65). But other elements in the prodigy-expiation complex could also serve the ends of propaganda and serve them better. The chief of these is the content of the expiatory rites which could be used to convey pointed messages to particular audiences, and it is to examples of these that we now turn.

was one of the demands pressed by the plebeian tribunes, Licinus and Sextius, and its accomplishment was a prelude to the passage of their major legislation in the following year (LIVY, 6.42.2). The *decemuiri* were the officiants of the *Graecus ritus* and had overall supervision of foreign cults in Rome, many of which had first been introduced on the authority of their Sibylline Books. It was the importance of these cults to the plebs – particularly that of Ceres, Liber, and Libera, which was instituted on the authority of the Books in 496 B.C., which attracted plebeian interest in the college.

See in general, Aline A. BOYCE, "The Development of the *Decemviri sacris faciundis*", *TAPA*, 69 (1938), 161-187 ; G. RADKE, *RE*, 24, *Halbband* (1963), "*Quindecemviri sacris faciundis*", 1114-1148 ; J. GAGÉ, *Apollon Romain ; essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développement du ritus Graecus à Rome des origines à Auguste*. Bibl. des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 182 (1955).

(64) We know little enough about precisely how and by whom reports of prodigies were made. They were reported sometimes by Roman officials (Livy, 32.1, 10-14), sometimes by private citizens (45.16, 5-6), sometimes presumably to the local authorities (34.45, 6-8 and 40.2, 1). The majority of Livy's introductory statements to his prodigy lists only contain vague references to the frightened and credulous citizenry (e.g. 21.62, 1 ; 24.10, 6 ; 27.23, 2 ; 27.37, 2 ; 28.11, 1 ; 29.14, 2).

(65) Refer to Appendix C, p. 115, below.

III. EXPIATIONS AS VEHICLES FOR COMMUNICATION

We may consider first four messages directed at Rome's Latin allies (66).

For the year 348 B.C. Livy (7.27,1) records a prodigious pestilence which was expiated with a *lectisternium* by order of the *decemuiri*. Lily Ross Taylor argued persuasively that, although Livy's notice partly conceals the fact, this prodigy was the occasion for the first performance of the Ludi Tarentini in honor of Dis and Proserpina, the ancestor of the later Ludi Saeculares (67). The Latin *populi* were already restive in 348 (68), and it is in the context of the gathering storm of the Latin rebellion that Taylor interpreted the prayer which was found inscribed on a newly discovered fragment of the *acta* of the Severan secular games : *te quaeso precorque uti tu (sc. Terra Mater) imperium maiestatemque p. R. Q. duelli domique auxis utque semper Latinus obtemperassit* (69). The phrase (which is repeated in the following prayer to Apollo and Diana) may safely be restored in all of the secular prayers both of the Severan ceremony and of the Augustan on which the later games were closely modelled (70). The quoted words, which, of course, have no relevance for

(66) My indebtedness to scholars who have discussed some of the following items will be indicated in the appropriate places below ; no one, to my knowledge, has brought them all together to document a consistent pattern of behavior.

(67) L. R. TAYLOR, "New Light on the History of the Secular Games", *AJP*, 55 (1934), 101-120 ; followed by, among others, A. PIGANIOL, "Jeux séculaires", *REA*, 38 (1936), 219-224 (repr. in *Coll. Latomus*, 132 [1973], 167-174). The legendary account of the origin of the Tarentine ritual closely connects it with pestilence (ZOSIMUS 2.1.-3 and VALERIUS MAXIMUS, 2.4., 5). Pestilences were most frequently expiated by *lectisternium* and/or *supplicatio*, but severe attacks called for extraordinary measures. That of 293 B.C. led to the importation of the cult of Aesculapius (LIVY, 10.47, 6). When the Tarentine games were renewed in 249 B.C. (the date at which they became centennial) the proximate cause was again a prodigy – this time, however, not pestilence but lightning striking the city wall (VARRO *ap* CENS., 17, 8 and PAULUS-FESTUS, 441-4 L.).

(68) LIVY, 7.25 assigns to that year a refusal on the part of the Latins to contribute soldiers to a joint Roman-Latin army.

(69) *CIL*, VI, 32326-32335 ; reproduced in G. B. PIGHI, *De ludis saecularibus p. R. Quiritium libri sex* (Milan, 1941 ; repr. 1965), 137-175.

(70) The sentiment is closely paralleled in the oracle transmitted to us by PHLEGON, (*Peri Makrob.*, 37.5, 2-4 in ZOS., *Hist. Nova*, 2.5., 6) appended to his description of the

the Severan or Augustan ages, have certainly been retained from the original ceremony despite the modifications which it later underwent, and they allow us to see how a prodigy and its expiation furnished an occasion to direct a warning to the Latins which they could not fail to notice (71). Tension between Rome and the Latins continued to grow in the 340's (72) and for 344 Livy records a prodigy *simile uetusto Montis Albani prodigio ; namque lapidibus pluit et nox interdiu uisa intendi.* The Books were inspected and P. Valerius Publicola was named *Dictator feriarum constituendarum causa*. Livy continues : "It was decided that a *supplicatio* should be performed not only by the tribes but by the neighboring peoples (*finitimi populi*) as well, and an order was established for them on which day each should make supplication" (73).

It is important to note that a prodigy occurring on the Alban Mount – the site of the Latin federal sanctuary of Jupiter Latiaris – is likely to have been seen as symbolically meaningful for the Latin *populi* (74). And we are told in this case that the *finitimi populi*, who can only be the neighboring

secular ritual : "... If you remember to do all this, all the land of Italy and of the Latins will always bear the yoke under your sceptre". The acknowledgement of Rome and Latium as separate entities in the context of these games was always retained in their official title, *Ludi Latini Saeculares*. Cf. HORACE's *CS*, v. 65 : *remque Romanam Latiumque ...*

348 B.C. is precisely the year in which Rome's second treaty with Carthage carefully specified which Latin cities were and were not subject to her (POLYB., 3.24).

(71) A further refinement may be added from a suggestion of R. E. A. PALMER's (*Roman Religion and Roman Empire* (Phila., 1974), 91 ff.) who sees behind the Moerae honored in the secular ritual nine ancient Fatae of Lavinium. If Lavinium's deities were thus singled out for honor the explanation must lie in the fact that Lavinium, of all the Latin *populi*, remained loyal to Rome in 340.

(72) See, for example, LIVY, 7.28, 104.

(73) LIVY, 7.28, 1-6. Livy surely means to say that this rain of stones occurred on the Alban mount like the earlier one (in the reign of Tullus) to which he compares it.

(74) This need not be true in every case, of course. Hail storms, or other phenomena, affecting the Mount will have been expiated whenever they occurred and these occasions would only fortuitously coincide with periods of Roman concern about their Latin allies – it is the expiation, not the mere occurence of the prodigy which reveals significance. Prodigies affecting the Mount, the Lake, or both are recorded nine times (LIVY, 1.31 ; 5.15 ; 7.28, 6-8 ; 25.7, 7 ; 27.11, 1-6 ; OBS., 38 ; DIO, 39.15-16 and 20, 2 ; OBS., 70). Of these, it is tempting to believe that at least that of 209 B.C. (LIVY, 27.11, 1-6 : *Albano monte tacta de caelo erant signum Iouis arborque templo propinqua ... cruentam etiam fluxisse aquam Albanam*) had some special significance in relation to the refusal of the twelve recalcitrant Latin colonies in that year to contribute further to the war effort (LIVY, 27.9-10). Livy's notice, however, fails to record any special expiation for these prodigies apart from a sacrifice which apparently served to expiate the whole group of prodigies in which they were included.

Latin cities, were compelled by order of a Sibylline oracle and under the supervision of a Dictator, to participate in the supplication that expiated it. This is the earliest recorded instance of *peregrini*, clearly distinguished by Livy from the *tribus* – the citizens, being included in a Roman expiation. It is to be taken closely and in the same context as the Tarentine ritual of four years earlier. An unmistakable message of Roman religious and political hegemony is being conveyed to disaffected Latins.

In contrast to the instances just described where it was Rome's purpose to intimidate the Latins on the eve of the great rebellion, the situation at the outbreak of the Hannibalic War was quite different. The Latins were now staunchly loyal and if Rome now acknowledged them on the occasion of a prodigy expiation the message was rather one of affirmation of the common bonds of political and religious unity which existed between them.

Livy begins the year 217 B.C. with a stupendous list of twenty-one prodigies which include the first reports from Sicily and Sardinia and the first from the federate allies – Arpi, Praeneste, and perhaps Falerii. The ancient Latin colony of Ardea did not witness a prodigy ; nevertheless, it was honored among the elaborate decemviral expiatory rites of that year : *decemuiri Ardeae in foro maioribus hostiis sacrificarunt* (75).

There are not many instances in which we are told that the *decemuiri* travelled outside of the City to perform expiations (76). But Ardea was a place of considerable religious importance to the Latins. It had been a member of the ancient League of Aricia and was, as well, a member of the Latin federation which celebrated its unity with Rome yearly on the Alban Mount (77). More to the point, however, Ardea housed an important pan-Latin cult of Venus. The Aphrodisium at Ardea is mentioned by Strabo, Pliny, and Pomponius Mela. According to Strabo, the Latins held religious festivals at the Ardeate Aphrodisium and, at the

(75) LIVY, 22.1, 8-20. The senate first expiated all the prodigies *en masse* with a sacrifice of *hostiae maiores* and a three day *supplicatio*. The *decemuiri*, then, after consulting the Books, recommended, in addition to the Ardeate expiation, the gift of a golden thunderbolt to Jupiter, gifts of silver to Juno and Minerva, a sacrifice in honor of Juno Regina on the Aventine and Juno Sospita of Lanuvium, a *lectisternium* and a donation of money to Aventine Juno, a gift of money by the freedwomen to Feronia, and a redesigned ritual in honor of Saturn which became the classical Saturnalia.

(76) The pilgrimage to Enna will be discussed below, p. 38. *Decemuiri* travelled to the borders of Gaul in 143 B.C. (DIO, 22, frag. 74), and apparently to the island of Cimolia in 108 (OBS., 40) for reasons which elude us.

(77) CATO, frag. 58 P. and DION. HAL. 5, 61 ; PLINY, *NH*, 3.68.

same time, the Ardeates also had charge of the temple of Aphrodite at Lavinium which was common to all the Latins. It is likely that the Roman *decemuiri* conjointly with representatives of all the Latin peoples honored Ardeate Venus there in 217 (78).

In addition to its relevance to Latin sympathies (and, very likely, its connection with the importation of Venus Erycina in that year) the rite may have been intended to convey still another significant message. Iberian Saguntum, which had fallen to Hannibal in 219, claimed ties of kinship with Ardea (79). In 217, perhaps very close to the time of the sacrifice, the brothers Scipio had crossed the Ebro and marched to Saguntum where (according to Polybius) they encamped near a temple of Aphrodite some five miles from the city (80). Palmer has suggested a connection between the sacrifice at Ardea and the simultaneous attempt to retake Saguntum (81). The two cities considered themselves kin and shared a cult of Aphrodite. The Romans (who had not lifted a finger to help Saguntum during its eight months' siege in 219) appear two years later using the occasion of an expiatory rite to advertise their spiritual oneness with their erstwhile ally. Surely it was hoped the message would get through.

In general throughout the Second Punic War expiatory ceremonies provided occasions for honoring popular Latin and Italian deities like Juno Sospita at Lanuvium and Feronia at Capena (82).

We may note finally an instance relevant once again to the Latin colony of Fregellae and, perhaps, to the Latins generally. After the rejection of her prodigy in 169, relations with Fregellae did not improve and we are probably justified in seeing in the prodigy material an additional sign of

(78) PLINY, *NH*, 3.57 ; MELA, 2.71 ; STRABO, 5.3, 5. We are told that the sacrifice was performed *in foro*, whereas the Aphrodisium apparently lay some distance outside the town. We should imagine, then, a procession similar, perhaps, to that held in Rome in 207 in which ritual acts were performed at several points along the route.

(79) In Silius Italicus' epic the Saguntine ambassador invokes this *cognatio* to the Romans (*Pun*., i 658-61, 665-69).

(80) POLYB., 3.97, 6 ; cf. LIVY, 22.22.

(81) PALMER, *op. cit*., 119-20 and n. 177.

(82) On Juno Sospita, see above, p. 12 and n. 16. On Feronia, who was worshipped far and wide in Italy, above n. 20. The principal center of her cult was a grove near the town of Capena in Tiberine Etruria. By order of the Sibylline Books she receives a gift from the freedwomen in 217 and a pontifical *supplicatio* in 210 – both times in response to prodigies at Capena (LIVY, 22.1, 8-20 and 27.4, 11-15). On the very significant attentions paid by the Romans to Etruscan Juno Regina we will have something to say in chap. V.

Roman response to the Fregellan problem on the eve of its revolt in 125 B.C. For 126 Obsequens (29) lists three prodigies concluding with an explosion of Mt. Aetna. In response to that prodigy the haruspices predicted *seditionem quae post tempora ea fuit*. It would be wrong to interpret this as a spurious *praedictio post euentum*. Rome was certainly aware in 126 that Fregellae (and possibly other Latin communities as well) was on the verge of rebellion. A prediction of *seditio* in this case is a clear warning which Fregellae, unfortunately, did not heed, although others may have.

Looking to audiences beyond the Latins we may note first the unusual sacrificial pilgrimage which the *Decemuiri* conducted to honor the great Ceres of Sicilian Enna in 133 B.C. Cicero, who is eloquent on the sanctity of Enna and its *antiquissima Ceres* makes it clear that this decemviral *legatio* was ordered by the Books in response to a series of prodigies in that year, though none of them apparently occurred in Sicily (83).

Le Bonniec is surely right is seeing the great Sicilian slave revolt of 135-132 as the motivation behind all this. There were strong religious overtones to that rising of, mainly Syrian, slaves led by the fire breathing Eunous who claimed to have received the gift of prophecy from the Syrian goddess Atargitis. Eunous had made Enna his headquarters and certainly Ceres, the divine protectress of the grain harvest on whose richness the wealth of the island and its landowning class depended, was polluted by the presence of Atargitis. The atonement made to Ceres after the supression of the revolt was undoubtedly in part a genuine act of placation to a goddess whom Romans had revered at home since the beginning of the fifth century B.C., and whom they had come to equate with the great Demeters of the Greek speaking world. Inescapably though, the pilgrimage was also a considered political gesture made for the benefit of the Sicilian landowners whose confidence in themselves and in the ability of Rome to protect them must have been severely shaken (84).

(83) Cic., II, *Verr.*, iv, 106-109. The incident is recounted more briefly by Valerius Maximus (1.1, 1) and Lactantius (*Inst. Diu.*, 2.4, 29). Obs. (27 a for 133 B.C.), while saying nothing of the expiation, does list a sampling of the prodigies which must be those to which Cicero refers in general.

(84) H. Le Bonniec, *Le culte de Cérès à Rome des origines à la fin de la république* (Paris, 1958), 367 ff. More than one view has been advanced as to the political connotation of the expiation. Carcopino, Bayet, and Gagé have offered variations of an interpretation relating it to Roman internal politics and the murder of Ti. Gracchus, by whom Ceres may have been invoked in propagandizing his agrarian reforms (J.

Finally, it should be recalled that prodigies (or, in part, quasi-prodigies) triggered the mobilization of politico-religious propaganda designed to convey the message of Rome's Trojan heritage on three famous occasions during the Second Punic War.

The importation of Sicilian Venus Erycina, the mother of Aeneas, in 217 B.C. (whose symbolic value has been well discussed by Schilling and others) (85) was one element in a large expiatory complex prescribed by the Sibylline Books. The Books were consulted by order of the Dictator Fabius in the aftermath of the debacle at Trasimene which was apparently viewed as a prodigy in itself (86).

In 213 B.C., in response to a rising wave of religious hysteria in the City, the praetor, M. Aemilius, on orders of the Senate, issued an edict that all illicit books of prophecy and incantation be surrendered to him. At the beginning of the following year Aemilius handed the confiscated material over to the new praetor, P. Cornelius Sulla, and from this source there rather mysteriously emerged two oracles which it was believed had been composed by one Marcius, and *illustris uates* of long ago (87). The oracles were of course, decemviral fabrications. M. Aemilius Lepidus, the praetor of 213, is most probably to be identified with the M. Aemilius who became a *decemuir* in 211 B.C. on the death of his kinsman M. Aemilius Numida (88). P. Cornelius Sulla (or Rufus Sibylla), the praetor of

CARCOPINO, *Histoire de Rome ; des Gracques à Sulla*, p. 185 ; J. BAYET, *Cerialia*, p. 352 ; J. GAGÉ, *Apollon romain*, p. 389 ff.). Some form of this interpretation need not by any means be excluded ; a propaganda stroke gains by being multi-valent, For Cicero, of course, anything that happened in the year 133 B.C. must somehow be brought into relation with the death of Gracchus. But the fact that the Roman Ceres of the plebs was not honored while in Sicily honors were paid not only to Ceres of Enna, but, as Diodorus (34-35, frag. 10) tells us, to Zeus Aitnaios throughout the island, clearly directs the main emphasis of the gesture to the Sicilian audience.

(85) R. SCHILLING, *Vénus* (Paris, 1954), 233-66. Schilling's analysis is generally followed by K. J. GALINSKY, *op. cit.*, 63, 172.

(86) LIVY, 22.9-10. Livy makes clear that Fabius' consultation of the Books without the occurrence of a prodigy strictly speaking was irregular, though not unprecedented. The Books were consulted without prior event of a prodigy in the ordinary sense in 390 B.C. (LIVY, 5.50) for the purification of the temples polluted by the Gauls ; in 225 B.C. (PLUT., *Marc.*, 3) on the occasion of Rome's first human sacrifice ; in 212 B.C. (on which, see below) ; and apparently in 143 B.C. (OBS., 21).

(87) LIVY, 25.1, 6-12.

(88) LIVY, 26.23, 7. The Aemilii in this period are difficult to sort out, but this is the conclusion of Broughton (*MRR*, see *sub an.*) ; cf. G. J. SZEMLER, *The Priests of the Roman Republic*, *Coll. Latomus*, 127 (1972), 158. The Aemilii were a prominent decemviral family.

212, from whose hands the *carmina Marciana* actually issued, was unquestionably a *decemuir*, as we are told by Macrobius [89]. Livy, typically, has missed the significance of this – as have most modern commentators as well [90].

The total functional interpenetration of the religious and the secular in Rome could not be more nicely illustrated than by this convergence in one and the same person of the priestly authority of the decemviral college and the police powers of the praetor in order to turn a politically dangerous outburst of religious hysteria to the political advantage of the State through religious means. The oracles themselves, which, in part, authorized the *decemuiri* to perform the first Ludi Apollinares, seem to have been viewed as prodigious in some sense and were expiated ; the Books were consulted and, not surprisingly, the Sibyl and Marcius were found to be in complete agreement [91]. It is clear that the oracles were designed to do more than calm the city populace or aggrandize the college of the *decemuiri*. The ancient *uates* addresses the Romans as "Troyborn" and foretells the defeat at Cannae in language whose Homeric idiom is unmistakable [92] – this at just the time that Valerius Laevinus in Greece

(89) MACROB., *Sat.*, 1.17, 27. We are told in addition by SERVIUS (*in Aen.*, vi, 72) that the *libri Martiorum* (sic) were stored with the Sibylline Books (and the Etruscan *libri Vegoici*) in Augustus' temple of Apollo. Undoubtedly the prophecies of Marcius had been associated with the Sibylline collection from the day the *decemuiri* wrote them.

(90) For example, GAGÉ, *op. cit.*, 270-79, seems to assume that the oracles somehow came into existence independently and thereby posed a problem for the *decemuiri* who had to decide how to deal with them. L. HERMANN ("Carmina Marciana", *Coll. Latomus*, 45, p. 117 ff.) has managed to arrange the verses into 'saturnians' which reveal the acrostich *Anci Marci*. The employment of acrostichs should put their decemviral origin beyond doubt, as DIELS suspected (*Sibyllinische Blätter* [Berlin, 1890], 9 ff. Hermann's further suggestion that the actual author of the verses was none other than Livius Andronicus is possible (he did contribute verses to the decemviral androgyne expiation of 207) though unprovable.

(91) The fact of the expiation is virtually certain. The crux is 25.12, 11 : *ad id carmen explanandum / expiandum diem unum sumpserunt*. The majority of the mss. read *explanandum*, the reading adopted by Weissenborn and Mueller (Teubner, 1906). Conway and Walters correctly adopted Sigonius' *expiandum* on the basis of MACROBIUS, *Sat.*, 1.17, 29 (*ex hoc carmine cum procurandi gratia dies unus rebus diuinis inpensus esset*). It seems, furthermore, out of the question that Livy made the inconsequential remark that they spent precisely one day in *explaining* the oracle.

(92) *Amnem, Troiugena, fuge Cannam flumen, ne te alienigenae cogant in campo Diomedis conserere manus. Sed neque credes tu mihi, donec compleris sanguine campum multaque milia occisa tua deferret amnis in pontum magnum ex terra frugifera ; piscibus atque auibus ferisque quae incolunt terras iis fuat esca caro tua ; nam mihi ita Iuppiter fatus est* (LIVY, 25.12, 5-7).

Livy paraphrases the oracle in prose ; presumably it had been composed in saturnians.

was draughting an alliance with the Aetolians against Philip ; Rome's first attempt to manipulate the mainland Greeks to her advantage.

Lastly, in connection with the importation of Cybele from Pergamum in 205 B.C., whose significance for Rome's foreign policy and the Trojan ideology requires no comment (93), we may briefly note two points which are often overlooked. First, this event too was put in train as the result of a prodigy, and one uniquely specific to its outcome. The black stone which was Cybele was fetched from Pessinus as the result of a prodigious rain of stones, the only prodigy for the year which Livy mentions (94). Appian's variant of the Sibylline oracle which was procured for the occasion, "... that something would fall from heaven at Pessinus in Phrygia, where the Mother of the Gods is worshipped by the Phrygians, which ought to be brought to Rome ..." (95) would seem to suggest a perceived relationship between the prodigy and its result. Second and more important is the wording of the Sibylline oracle, as Livy gives it, which authorized the act. There for the first time in such a context we find reference to *Italia* and *terra Italiae* as the place from whence the enemy will be expelled if the Great Mother is received. The Delphic oracle of 216 and the Marcian oracle of 212 (both decemviral products) had spoken only of *res publica uestra* or *agro uestro*. *Italia* is something new. More than one political message was being broadcast in 205 B.C. (96).

By way of summarizing our results so far, let us emphasize again that it would be a serious misconception of the Roman religious mentality in the period here under review to assume either that prodigies were regularly manufactured or that expiations were ever performed with only "ulterior" ends in view. In fact, it seems futile to try to distinguish what we should call "religious" from other kinds of motivations. Romans were alarmed by untoward events in the natural order and found psychic relief in making ritualized responses to them. Nevertheless, the utility of religion

(93) See H. GRAILLOT, *Le culte de Cybèle, mère des dieux, à Rome et dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 1912), 46-51.

(94) LIVY, 29.10, 4 ff.

(95) APPIAN, *Hann.*, 5.6.

(96) *Quandoque hostis alienigena terrae Italiae bellum intulisset eum pelli Italia uincique posse si Mater Idaea a Pessinunte Romam aduecta foret.* Cf. LIVY, 23.11, 2-4 : *Si ita faxitis, Romani, uestrae res meliores facilioresque erunt magisque ex sententia res publica uestra uobis procedet uictoriaque duelli populi Romani erit* ... ; and 25.12, 8-10 : *Hostes, Romani, si ex agro expellere uoltis, uomicam quae gentium uenit longe, Apolloni uouendos censeo ludos*, etc.

was never lost on them and the prodigy-expiation complex provided ready occasions for significant political gestures which could hardly be ignored. It is in this, I believe, that an important part of their value may be seen.

In the following chapters we examine a body of prodigy and expiation material which will shed light on Rome's relations with Etruria. In particular we attempt to elucidate the role of the Etruscan haruspices in that context.

IV. THE HARUSPICES AT ROME

The presence in Rome of the Etruscan haruspices who were, from time to time, summoned by the Senate to participate in the interpretation and procuration of Roman prodigies, represents a unique state of affairs and one which has never been wholly accounted for. In no other society, ancient or modern, has a priesthood of foreign nationality been permitted to enjoy such an intimate relationship to the religious (and sometimes political) life of the host people (97). The explanation, I believe, is to be found in a consideration of two factors. First (and this point has been consistently noted by scholars) the Romans were genuinely impressed with the elaborate body of Etruscan divinatory techniques that were contained in their sacred books, known collectively to the Romans as the *Etrusca disciplina* (98).

But a second factor, though often noted in passing, has not received the attention which it deserves. The haruspices had a life beyond the practice of their discipline – they were aristocrats ; members of the local oligarchies of their cities, or, at least, kinsmen of those oligarchs (99).

(97) Despite the arguments of Harris to the contrary (*op. cit.*, 194-195), it must be supposed that haruspices were *peregrini* before the Social War. It is inconceivable that Ti. Gracchus the Elder in denouncing the haruspices in 163 B.C. could have called Roman citizens *Tusci ac barbari* (Cicero, *Nat. Deor.*, 4.10, 11).

(98) See the fundamental work of C. O. Thulin, *Die Etruskische Disciplin*. 3 vols. (Goteborg, 1906-9), and, more succinctly, in *RE*, xi (1907), "Etrusca Disciplina". On the Etruscan lightning lore, see S. Weinstock, "Libri Fulgurales", *PBSR*, 19 (n.s. 6) (1951), 122-153.

(99) The evidence is set out in Thulin, *RE*, vii, 2 (1912), "Haruspices", 2437. The principal ancient passages are : Cic., *Diu.* 1.92 ; Val. Max., 1.1, 1 ; Tac., *Ann.*, 11.15 ; Cic., *Leg.*, 2.21 ; Cens., *Die Nat.*, 4.13 ; Cic., *ad Fam.*, 6.6, 3 ; Bern scholiast on Lucan, 1, 636. The evidence for the nobility of haruspices does not, of course, apply to those haruspices who were low-ranking *apparitores* of Roman and municipal magistrates as evidenced, for example, in *Lex Colon. Genet.*, 62 (*CIL*, I², 594) ; they are clearly a different group and we are not concerned with them. Nor are we concerned with the self-proclaimed "village haruspices" referred to by Cicero in *Diu.*, 1.132, and who were undoubtedly the object of Cato's slighting remarks in *Agr.*, 5, 4 and *Diu.*, 2.51.

This fact takes on significance when seen in the context of what we know concerning Rome's relations with the local Italian oligarchies in general ; relations which were typically close and mutually supportive. In return for their loyalty and the maintenance of good order in their cities, the Roman oligarchy supported local oligarchs at home, sometimes intermarried with them, and occasionally rewarded them with citizenship and brought them within the Roman establishment ([100]). These techniques of supporting local oligarchic rule can be observed in Etruria – a region which, from the time of its incorporation into the Roman confederation, was, perhaps, the most strategically crucial to Rome of any area in Italy ([101]). Rome put down seditions in Etruria in favor of the local *principes* on three occasions that we know of : at Arretium in 302 B.C., at Volsinii in 265 B.C., and in Etruria generally in 196 B.C. ([102]). Further it seems possible to identify some Etruscan families who were awarded citizenship and a place in the Roman establishment prior to the Social War – though enfranchisement, as elsewhere in Italy, was never a predominant mode of conciliating local oligarchs ([103]).

It is in this well established political context that we may detect an important part of the explanation for the activity of the haruspices at Rome. I suggest that the invitation to haruspices to offer opinions in the senate on the proper interpretation of Roman prodigies – tentatively at first in the third century, but increasingly during the Second Punic War and thereafter – represents an effort on the part of the Roman government to cater to the religious sensibilities (and, indeed, to the considerable self esteem) of these aristocratic diviners and their kinsmen. This can be shown to be true particularly at those times when only Etruria stood

(100) Cf. the explication of Rome's relations with the Campanian oligarchies from the 4th century B.C. on by J. HEURGON, *Capoue pré-romain* (Paris, 1942), and by A. BERNARDI, "Roma e Capua nella secondo metà del quarto secolo av. J.-C., Part II", *Ath.*, 31 (n.s. 21) (1943). See also E. T. SALMON, *Samnium and the Samnites*, p. 293 ff. ; F. MÜNZER, *Röm. Adels* (Stuttgart, 1920), passim ; for a general survey of the evidence, A. J. TOYNBEE, *Hannibal's Legacy*, I, 330-40.

(101) On the whole subject of Rome's support of and reliance on the Etruscan *principes* for the good behavior of Etruria, see HARRIS, *op. cit.*, 129-144 ("The Alliance at Work"). He makes the point that the generally excellent understanding which Rome was able to achieve with the Etruscan oligarchies relieved her of the very great burden and expense of extensive colonization in Etruria throughout most of the Republican period.

(102) LIVY, 10.3-5 ; ZON., 8.7, 4-8 ; LIVY, 33.36 ; all well discussed by Harris.

(103) See HARRIS, *op. cit.*, 192-201. In general, local oligarchs served Roman interests best when they remained active in their own cities.

between Rome and a succession of northern invaders – Gauls, Carthaginians, Cimbri and Teutons.

This political aspect of the haruspices' activity may emerge from a consideration of the date and circumstances of their first authentic appearance in Rome. Contrary to what Livy, Dionysius and others thought, it is unlikely that haruspices had always been present at Rome (or only exceptionally absent from it) since the days of the Tarquins. Instances where their presence is noted are either wholly apocryphal or, if historical, haruspices (*uates*, *μάντεις*) are associated with them in a purely conventional and uninformed manner. The legendary character of Tarquin's serpent, Romulus' institutions, the rain of stones under Tullus, the Capitoline head, the Sabine cow, the supernatural destruction of Suessa Pometia, or the Lacus Curtius requires no comment. The haruspex Lucius Aquinius' advice is connected with a false etymology of the *dies atri*. Decius' *deuotio* at Veseris is the least likely of the three Decian *deuotiones* to be historical, and, in any case, haruspices are brought into the account in a purely perfunctory way. The *incestum* of the Vestals in 483 and 472 may be genuine but, again, the references to *uates* and *μάντεις* there are conventional and, in part, confused (haruspices did not consult the flight of birds) (104). The haruspex Manius, whose activity is recorded for 296 B.C. by Dio, is highly suspicious. Livy knows nothing of him. The prodigies to which he is said to respond are unparalleled and his interpretation of them comes close to parody of the haruspicial style in its elaborate allegorizing (105). If there is a historical kernel to the story, it suggests at most not the presence of an organized body of haruspices but only a single private haruspex – possibly one connected with some Roman family of Etruscan origin.

(104) Livy, 1.56, 5 (Tarquin); Dion. Hal., 2.22, 3 (Romulus); Livy, 1.31 (Tullus); 1.51, 5-6 (Capitoline head); 1.45, 5 (Sabine cow); Pliny, *NH*, 7.68-69 (Suessa); Varro, *LL*, 5.148 (Lacus Curtius); Macrob., *Sat.*, 1.16, 22-24 (Aquinius); Livy, 8.6., 9-12 and 9, 1 (Decius); 2.42, 10 and Dion. Hal., 9.40, 1-4 (*incestum*). Some of these passages do not, in fact, name haruspices but make only vague references to vates or *μάντεις* – terms which often, though not always, suggest haruspices. On the important passage in Gellius (4.5, 1) which may well be historical but is not earlier, I think, than the third century B.C., see below, p. 54.

(105) Dio, 8 in Zon., 8.1, 3. On the prodigies, see Wülker, *op. cit.*, 13. This is the only instance of either blood, milk, or honey flowing from an altar, and the only instance of honey flowing from anything. Many haruspicial interpretations rely on allegory – sometimes transparent, often obscure; none, however, are as extended or elaborate as Manius', as can be seen in Appendix D, p. 121 ff.

Scholars who have discussed the haruspices have not attempted to relate their presence in Rome to the changing realities of Roman-Etruscan political relations in any precise way. Bouché-Leclerq, Thulin, and Pfiffig follow the ancients in believing that haruspices were present in Rome from the period of the Tarquins and continuously thereafter (though allowing for some fluctuations in their availability). Wissowa and Bloch correctly reject the early notices as apocryphal but remain vague on the precise point at which haruspicial activity at Rome should be considered historical. Wülker, finally, did correctly point to 278 B.C. as the earliest recorded historical appearance of a group of haruspices acting in a formal relationship with the Roman senate, but he failed to draw any larger conclusions from this ([106]).

We may readily admit the likelihood that haruspices, in whatever form they existed in the sixth century B.C. will have been present at Rome under the Tarquins (although it is unlikely that any authentic detail of their activity in that period survived in the annalistic tradition) ([107]). Later on, of course, Rome did not live in complete cultural isolation from Etruria ([108]). But for so long as Rome defined her relationship with Etruria as one of permanent and unbroken hostility (intermittent warfare interrupted only by *indutiae* which, by definition, anticipate the resumption of open war), it is impossible to believe that she allowed the Etruscan enemy access to the political and religious machinery of the State. This permanent state of hostility with Etruria appears, however, to have come to an end sometime between the years 280 and 278 B.C. when,

(106) A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, Vol. 4 (1882), 104 ff. ; C. O. Thulin, *Etr. Disc.*, III, 129 ff. and *RE* "Haruspices", v. 14, col. 2433 f. ; A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio Etrusca* (1975), 46 ; G. Wissowa, *RKR*², 543 ff. ; R. Bloch, *Les prodiges*, 86 ff. and *Mélanges Ernout* (1940), 21-28 ; Wülker, p. 37. The prodigy is described below.

(107) Their influence on the Sibylline Books seems to me to be an intractable question. Only one point stands out clearly : The Etruscan Tarquin (if, in fact, he has any historical association with the adoption or creation of the Sibylline oracles) distinctly did not place the oracles in the hands of any Etruscan priesthood. They are associated from the beginning with the *duumuiri* (later *decemuiri* and *quindecemuiri*) *sacris faciundis*, whose title is purely Roman (cf. the *II uiri perduellionis*, *VII uiri epulones*, *III uiri reipublicae constituendae*).

(108) The *ludi scaenici*, for example, were adopted from Etruria in 364 B.C., initially with the importation of Etruscan *histriones* (Livy, 7.2, 1-7).

as Harris has now argued convincingly, permanent peaceful relations with the Etruscan cities were sealed by *foedera* (109).

Only from the moment at which Rome had established stable treaty relations with the Etruscans would it have been either possible or desirable to cement those important concomitant informal relationships with the local oligarchies by arranging for the occasional participation of haruspices in the procuration of Roman prodigies.

Our prodigy lists for the early and middle decades of the third century B.C. are so meager that one should hesitate in principle to accept the first recorded appearance of any prodigy phenomenon as its first actual occurrence. Nevertheless, it seems difficult to overlook the coincidence of the final political settlement of Etruria in, or shortly before, 278 B.C. with the first fully believable notice of the activity of haruspices in Rome in that year, when (as Cicero informs us) having been summoned by the Senate, they succeeded in locating the head of the statue of Jupiter which had been propelled by lightning from the roof of the Capitoline temple into the Tiber, a thousand feet away. This spectacular "coup de théâtre" (however they performed it – but it certainly drew on their well-known ability to chart the direction of lightning bolts) resulted in the dedication of a temple to Jupiter Summanus and is thus firmly anchored in the historical record (110).

There are some additional indications which suggest that we are correct in locating the beginning of haruspicial activity in Rome in the early part

(109) HARRIS, *op. cit.*, chap. ii and iii, and "Roman Foedera in Etruria", *Historia*, 14 (1965), 282-292. The Fasti Triumphales record triumphs *de Etrusceis* by Q. Marcius Philippus, cos. 281, and *(de V)ulsiniensibus et Vulcientib.*, by T. Coruncanius cos. 280. The periocha of Livy xiii notes *res praeterea contra ... Etruscos prospere gestas continet* – referring to a period probaly later than the beginning of 280 but not extending beyond the middle of 278 B.C. Subsequently, the only recorded hostilities with any Etruscan city are an abortive rebellion of Caere, probably to be dated to 274 or 273 B.C. (although it may belong, in fact, to the 290's), and the attack on Volsinii in 265-4 B.C. ; but here Zonaras' account implies that a treaty already existed with Volsinii by virtue of which the Romans were enabled to act in support of the local oligarchy there.

Harris' argument for Etruscan *foedera* is accepted substantially by P. W. WALBANK, review in *CR*, 24 (1974), 92 ff. and by R. G. LEWIS, review in *JRS*, 63 (1973), 247 ff. A. J. PFIFFIG, has dissented in articles in *REL*, 44 (1966), *Historia*, 15 (1966), *Historia*, 17 (1968), *Gymnasium*, 75 (1968), and *Gnomon*, 43 (1971), p. 46. For an adequate rebuttal of Pfiffig's arguments, see HARRIS, *Historia*, 22 (1973), 356-58.

(110) CIC., *Diu.*, 1.16 and LIVY, *Per.*, 14. On the temple of Summanus, WISSOWA, *RKR*², 122 and 135. WÜLKER (above, n. 10) viewed this incident correctly as the earliest recorded historical instance of the haruspices' activity in Rome.

of the third century B.C. Pliny tells us that in about 275 B.C. the haruspices began for the first time to observe the heart among the entrails ([111]). I can suggest nothing about the meaning of this innovation but only emphasize the fact that haruspices, at a date close to that which I suggest for their debut in Rome, appear either to be introducing to the Romans a hitherto unknown detail in the inspection of entrails or, perhaps, modifying their own techniques of extispicine to conform with some Roman preference ([112]).

In general, it can be seen that the acceptance of Etruscan haruspices at Rome belongs distinctly in a third century context. Though the haruspices are in many ways a unique group they should be seen in relation to other foreign priesthoods whom the Senate permitted to be established in Rome – a phenomenon which does not antedate the third century B.C. It appears virtually certain, for example, that Aesculapius brought his priests and attendants with him when he was established on the Tiber Island in 292 B.C. ([113]) (And there is no indication of the establishment of a foreign priesthood at Rome earlier than this). Also in the third century the Greek priestesses of Ceres (recruited mainly from Naples and Velia) were brought to Rome and, in this case, since their duties as *sacerdotes publicae* required it, given the citizenship. Le Bonniec dates their introduction to 226/5 B.C. in the context of the Gallic invasion of that year, and he stresses the point that the honors extended to Demeter and her priestesses, who will have been the daughters of Campanian aristocrats, were

(111) PLINY, *NH*, 11.186. See *MRR* under 275 B.C. for the date ; THULIN, *Etr. Disc.*, ii, 22 for discussion.

(112) Extispicine, being a branch of haruspicial science unconnected with the expiation of prodigies, will not concern us in this study. It suffices to note that Etruscan extispicine, whose purpose is divinatory, is to be clearly distinguished from the indigenous Roman *probatio* of the entrails of the sacrificial victim simply to ascertain that they are normal so that the sacrifice may be proclaimed a *litatio*. (See R. SCHILLING, "A propos des *exta* : L'extispicine étrusque et la *litatio* romain", *Coll. Latomus*, 58 (1962), 1371-78 ; BOUCHÉ-LECLERQ, *op. cit.*, iv. 109). Although Etruscan "gut-gazers" (which is probably the meaning of the Latin, *haruspex*) became indispensable assistants of Roman magistrates and generals (such that Livy, for example, assumes their presence in that capacity at the devotion of Decius, as noted above), it should be emphasized that, unlike the taking of the auspices for which Roman augurs were required to be present, extispicine has no essential relationship to the definition of *imperium*, and there is no necessity for assuming its practice in Rome earlier than 278 B.C.

(113) WISSOWA, *RKR*^{2}, 306 ; Latte, *RR*, 225. The Roman shrine appears to have operated in every way precisely like the Epidaurian Asklepieion. A priesthood of native Romans could not have managed the specialized procedures involved.

intended in part as a gesture to the local oligarchies of Campania and Magna Graecia and the cities which they governed – precisely the point which we make with respect to the haruspices (114).

Finally, of course, at the very end of the century, the Magna Mater arrived accompanied by her Phrygian Galli. All in all, it seems difficult to place the arrival of the haruspices in advance of this third century context. We conclude then that 278 B.C. was the year in which an organized body of haruspices entered into a formal and continuing relationship with the Roman State for the first time since, at least, the period of the Etruscan monarchy.

To speak thus of an organized body of haruspices, however, involves us in the perennially vexed question of the epigraphically attested *ordo ex sexaginta* – its nature and its date. The *elogia Tarquiniensia* raise more questions than they provide answers and, despite Torelli's belief in the antiquity of the *ordo*, at least one cautious scholar remains unconvinced of this (115). The crucial evidence here continues to be not epigraphic but literary : Cicero's statement (*de Diu.* 1.92) that, ... *tum cum florebat imperium, (senatus) decreuit ut de principum filiis + sex singulis Etruriae populis in disciplinam traderentur* ... The vague chronological reference is probably to circa mid second century B.C., but the decree presupposes an already existing arrangement which the Roman State is moving to support (116). The number *sex* is clearly corrupt and can almost certainly be emended to *decem* (that is *X ex singulis* ...) on the strength of the parallel notice in Valerius Maximus (117). At the same time, it is clear that the haruspices stood in some formal relation to the *duodecim populi Etruriae* whose existence at least as a religious amphictyony cannot be doubted, however we may view its political role, or lack thereof (118). The

(114) Le Bonniec, *op. cit.*, 381-398.

(115) M. Torelli, *Elogia Tarquiniensia* (Florence, 1975), 119 ff. ; E. Rawson, "Caesar, Etruria, ad the Disciplina Etrusca", *JRS*, 68 (1978), 140, 147, still prefers a date as late as Augustus for the organization of the *ordo*.

(116) The point is made by Pease, *Comm.*, at 1.92 ; cf. Thulin, *op.cit.*, iii, 145.

(117) Val Max., 1.1., 1 : *ut ... decem principum filii senatus consulto singulis Etruriae populis percipiendae sacrorum disciplinae gratia traderentur*. For the emendation see Pease, *ibid.* ; Thulin, *op. cit.*, iii, 143, n. 2 ; and Müller, *Die Etrusker*, ii, 4, n. 13. The Roman government's care for the preservation of the *ordo* was, of course, voiced again by the emperor Claudius in 47 A.D. when he apparently refounded it (Tac., *Ann.*, 11.15).

(118) Tages is said to have taught the discipline to *duodecim principum pueris* – a tradition which can only be based on the fact that the haruspices, or some of them, had a known connection with the League of the Twelve *Populi* (*Schol. Bern.* ad Lucan, *Phars.*,

senatus consultum to which Cicero refers, then, will have provided for a pool of 120 candidates (ten *filii* times "twelve" populi), a number which can be related very neatly to an organization of sixty – it is its exact double ; thus providing for twice the number of trainees as will eventually be required as full-fledged haruspices or, perhaps, envisioning twice the number of haruspices as will be required to consult on any given occasion. The point to be stressed, in any case, is that the number sixty (unparalleled in any Roman college, sacred or secular) can hardly be a Roman contribution ; it must be Etruscan and be somehow related to the Twelve *Populi*. Once this is admitted, it is (despite the late date of the surviving inscriptions ([119])) much likelier to be old than recent.

As all too often in an area where solid evidence is lacking, we are reduced to the mere weighing of probabilities ; but it seems finally inconceivable that the Roman Senate did not from the very beginning require some formal organization of the haruspices with whom it intended to deal ([120]).

It is worth noting that the first prodigy with which the haruspices dealt at Rome was a lightning prodigy. Fulgural lore was the most elaborate and impressive branch of their discipline and they came virtually to monopolize lightning prodigies at Rome. Of the thirteen lightning prodigies recorded in our sources where we are told exactly what was done and by whom (which, it should be noted, is not true for the majority

1.636). The political role of the *consilium Etruriae* in the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. has very likely been exaggerated by Livy and Dionysius but there is, nevertheless, no difficulty in believing that, like amphictyonies in the Greek world, it could on occasion provide a structure for concerted action. There are numerous discussions – some more critical of the sources than others : see, among others J. Heurgon, "L'État étrusque", *Historia*, 6 (1957), 86 ff. and H. H. Scullard, *The Etruscan Cities and Rome* (Ithaca, 1967), 231 ff.

(119) The inscriptions can be found collected in Wissowa, RKR², 548, nn. 8 and 9 ; Thulin, *op. cit.*, iii, 159 ff. ; Latte, *RR*, 159, n. 1. The earliest of them, *CIL*, VI, 32439 (*L. Vinulleius, L.f. Pom. Lucullus aruspex ex sexaginta*) is not earlier than the first century B.C. Wissowa is, I think, unjustified in regarding the *ordo* as comprising only the relatively lowly *apparitores* of the Roman and municipal magistrates; although indeed by the imperial period genuine Etruscan *principes* were hard to find and prodigies were rarely expiated in the traditional ways. For both of these reasons, the *ordo* as we meet it in the inscriptions may have declined in status and in the importance of its activities. Nevertheless, the *magister publicus haruspicum* who describes himself as a salaried *haruspex Augustorum ducenarius* may not be a member of our *ordo* at all (cf. Thulin, iii, 146).

(120) A conclusion reached also by Latte, *RR*, 397.

of notices) haruspices are involved with ten – seven times alone and three times in company with the *decemuiri* (121). Their most characteristic response to lightning bolts (as indeed to most other kinds of prodigies to which they respond) is the offering of an interpretation consisting of, at least, a statement of to whom the prodigy pertains. In the case of statues struck by lightning (of which haruspices handle three of the four recorded instances where the prodigy is singled out from the group of prodigies with which it is listed) their response involves doing something to the statue – either finding its missing part (as in 278 B.C.) or re-positioning it according to some theory of orientation which involves its elevation and position relative to the sun (122). It seems a reasonable presumption that it was their expertise in the handling of lightning bolts, perhaps more than any other aspect of the discipline, which principally attracted Roman interest to them (123).

In fact, one element in particular of haruspicial lightning lore must have seemed particularly awesome to the Romans – that was their ability to call down lightning at will and, in fact, to use it as a weapon of war. Pliny recounts an Etruscan myth about king Porsina of Volsinii, who called down lightning to destroy a monster, Olta, who was ravaging Volsinian fields (124). In 408 A.D. "haruspices" appeared at Rome and offered to

(121) Cic., *Diu.*, 1.16 ; Gellius, *NA*, 4.5, 1 ; Livy, 27.27, 8 ; 42.20, 1-6 ; Pliny, *NH*, 2.144 ; Obs., 37 and Plut., *QR*, 83 ; Obs., 44 ; App., *BC*, 1.78 ; Cic., *Diu.*, 1.19-20 and *Cat.*, 3.19 ; Tac., *Ann.*, 13.24.

(122) An instance of this recounted by Gellius will be examined in detail below. Another instance is that given by Cicero (*Diu.*, 1.19-20 for 65 B.C.) for which see Appendix D, p. 122.

(123) Their special preeminence in lightning lore is acknowledged in our sources : e.g. Cic., *Diu.*, 1.92 *Etruria autem de caelo tacta scientissime animaduertit eademque interpretatur* Diod., 5.42 to the same effect. Both Pliny (*NH*, 2.138-144) and Seneca (*NQ*, 2.39-51) devoted several chapters each to presenting syntheses of Etruscan fulgural lore as they understood it. On the difficult question of precisely what constituted the differences between the haruspicial method of handling lightning bolts and the so-called pontifical method which will have been in use before 278 B.C., see Bouché-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, 32-57 ; Thulin, *op. cit.*, i, 92 ff. and 114 ff. ; Wissowa, "Bidental", in *RE*, 5, col. 429 ff. ; *idem*, *RKR*², 120 ff. ; Ogilvie, *Comm.*, at Livy 1.20, 4 ; and Weinstock, *art. cit.*, 142-43 (all on Numa and Juppiter Elicius) ; Wissowa, *RKR*², 122 (on Juppiter Fulgur). The association of the lightning bolt with Jupiter is undoubtedly an indigenous Latin conception, but beyond this there seems to be little agreement among students of the question. Whatever the pontifical-decemviral method of procurating lightning bolts had been in earlier times, it is increasingly pushed into the background by the more imposing "science" of the haruspices.

(124) Pliny, *NH*, 2.140. The Roman, Tullus Hostilius, in attempting the same trick, cremated himself (Livy, 1.31) – a cautionary tale ?

save the Eternal City from Alaric (as they had done shortly before elsewhere) by attacking him with lightning ([125]). In 480 B.C. during a war with Veii the tent of the consul Manlius was said to have been struck by lightning to the great joy of the enemy haruspices ([126]), and the annalistic tradition preserved two instances – in 426 and 356 B.C. ([127]) – where, in battle against the Etruscans, Roman armies were assailed by *sacerdotes* brandishing torches, which may just be the actual gesture either for drawing down the lightning or for representing it as having been drawn down. It is possible also that the term *fulguriator* (Etr. *trutnvt* ?) on the bilingual from Pisaurum (CIL XI 6363 : *(L. Ca)fatius L. f. Ste. haruspe(x) fulguriator)* designates a specialist not only in the interpretation and burial of *fulgura* but in the conjuring of them as well ([128]).

Now the very earliest notice of a lightning prodigy in our lists, dated to 295 B.C., records that, *in exercitu Appi Claudi plerosque fulminibus ictos nuntiatum est* ([129]). Of the expiation we are told only that for this prodigy and for a pestilence and a rain of earth grouped with it, *libri ob haec aditi* – that is, the *decemuiri* somehow handled the expiation of all three. We are not told exactly where Appius' army was when some of his soldiers were struck by lightning, but he spent part of that year in Etruria ([130]). It is tempting to think that the prodigy befell his army there and might have been reported by Appius himself in that despatch which Livy tells us he sent to the senate from Etruria ([131]), or in person after his return to Rome. If this should be the case, we are entitled to suppose that Appius' men believed that they had been attacked by haruspices with lightning ; Romans, by this time (at least those with experience in Etruria) must have understood that this was something that haruspices could do.

The next lightning prodigy recorded in our lists is that of 278 B.C. where, as we have seen, haruspices for the first time appear at the service

(125) Zosimus, *Hist. Noua*, 5.41 ; Sozomen, 9.6 ; a marvellous instance of late pagan antiquarianism in action. Our authorities differ over whether the offer was accepted.

(126) Dion. Hal., 9.6, 3.

(127) Livy, 4.33 and 7.17.

(128) This is the interpretation of Bloch, *op. cit.*, 150 and n. 2.

(129) Livy, 10.31, 8.

(130) He had been stationed there in 296 as consul and continued there as praetor throughout a good part of 295 until he was relieved by Fabius Rullianus (Livy, 10.24, 18-26). He then returned to Rome and, after the death of Decius at Sentinum, took charge of Decius' army in Campania and Samnium for the remainder of that year (10.31, 3-7). See Salmon, *Samnium*, 264 ff.

(131) Livy, 10.24, 18 : *Appi Claudi praetoris allatas ex Etruria litteras.*

of the Roman government. It may be, then, that as much as their ability to procurate lightning bolts, it was their ability to attack with them which helped convince the Romans that the haruspices ought rather to be friends than enemies.

Although we may take it that the majority opinion in Roman governing circles favored the invitation to haruspices to perform in Rome, resistence to this idea in some quarters evidently persisted for a time. We may catch echoes of a "debate" on the desirability of employing haruspices in a few famous anecdotes in which they are depicted as cunning, treacherous and disloyal ([132]). Further, the fact that none of these tales seems to predate the third century B.C. lends further weight to our argument for the date at which haruspices were first introduced.

We may note first the famous myth of the Capitoline head in which Olenus Calenus, the wisest haruspex of Etruria, tries to capture the good omen (that the spot where the head was found would be the "head of all Italy") by urging the Roman ambassadors to reveal to him the precise coordinates of its place of discovery. His cunning is thwarted by his son's warning to the Romans to be on their guard ([113]). The kernel of the myth is, as Weinstock has shown, an *aition* of the name Capitolium, deriving it probably from '*caput* Oli'or'Auli' (hence, eventually the haruspex's name, Olenus) ([134]). In its developped form the story shows a familiarity with haruspicial techniques of orientation and with their belief that destiny could be altered by the capturing or transferring of an omen ([135]). But the myth, in the form in which Dionysius and Pliny knew it, is principally a cautionary tale on the craftiness and hostility of haruspices. Now the idea of Rome as the *caput orbis terrarum* does not antedate the Pyrrhic war ([136]), and what appear to be representations of the story on Roman gems are also not earlier than the third century ([137]). Thus the story of

(132) The question of anti-haruspicial feeling in Rome can be distinguished from the larger phenomenon of the philosophical debate over the value of divination *per se*, which had been going on in the Graeco-Roman world for a long time and in which haruspicial apologists also sometimes became involved.

(133) Dion. Hal., 4.59-61 ; Livy, 1.55, 5-6 ; Pliny, *NH*, 28.13 ; Arnob., 6.7 ; Serv., *ad Aen.*, viii, 345 ; Zon., 7.11 ; Isid., 15.231.

(134) S. Weinstock, "Olenus", in *RE*, 17, 2 (1937), following by Ogilvie, *Comm.*, 211 ff.

(135) Bloch, *op. cit.*, 57-59, who however, errs in seeing the story as a piece of genuine historical tradition descending from the age of the Tarquins.

(136) Weinstock and Ogilvie, *loc. cit.*

(137) Furtwängler, *Antike Gemmen*, 245.

Olenus reflects anti-haruspicial sentiment at Rome going back probably to the generation which saw their first appearance there.

To the same effect, but more interesting and complex is the story recounted in Aulus Gellius in which haruspices are summoned from Etruria to advise on the expiation of a lightning bolt which had struck a statue of Horatius Cocles in the comitium. Out of secret hatred for the Romans they give false directions for relocating the statue to a place devoid of sunlight. They are then betrayed, tried, and executed. The statue is moved to an elevated location in the *area Vulcani* and all turns out well for the Roman people. In memory of the event, a line adapted from Hesiod (*malum consilium consultori pessimum est*) is chanted by boys throughout the city. Gellius claims to have found this story in Book Eleven of the *Annales Maximi* and in Book One of Verrius Flaccus' *Res Memoria Dignae* (138).

The story as Gellius gives it is not, of course, a simple archival entry ; it is a literary confection whose formal purpose is to provide an aetiology for the proverb with which it concludes – this much is recognized by all. I follow Crake in believing that Gellius had read the story only in Flaccus' work and that it is probably to him that the literary embellishments are attributable (139). The annalistic entry will have recorded the prodigy, the consultations of the haruspices and the peregrinations of the statue and attendant rites with which the pontiffs must have been concerned. But clearly the story must have enjoyed currency in popular tradition outside the *Annales*, and it is in this tradition, beginning at a date probably contemporaneous with the actual event that the invidious interpretation of the haruspices' motives was grafted on to whatever real misunderstanding had, in fact, occurred (140).

Attempts to date the episode have ranged from the fifth century B.C. (suggested by Gagé from a feeling that this degree of Roman credulity is appropriate only to an early date) (141), to the later second century,

(138) GELLIUS, *NA*, 4.5, 1.

(139) J. E. A. CRAKE, "The Annals of the Pontifex Maximus", *CP*, 35 (1940), 385 f. E. RAWSON, "Prodigy Lists and the Use of the Annales Maximi", *CQ*, 21 (1971), 168, holds a contrary view.

(140) BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, *op. cit.*, 47-8, sees in the episode, correctly, I think, a Roman misunderstanding of still unfamiliar Etruscan responses to lightning, and certainly not premeditated treachery on the part of the haruspices.

(141) J. GAGÉ, "Une consultation d'haruspices : sur les tabous étrusques de la statue dite d'Horatius Cocles", *Latomus*, 32 (1973), 2-22.

suggested by Walbank who reasons that a story involving Horatius' statue must postdate the version of the Horatius legend given by Polybius (the earliest written version that we have) in which there is no mention of a statue ([142]). But there was no particular reason for Polybius, who only recounts the legend in the context of the kinds of "stories" that inspired Roman boys, to note a statue that was thought to represent the hero.

In fact, common sense will allow us to reduce considerably the gap between the dates offered by Gagé and Walbank. Neither takes into account the one crucial fact that we are given : that some form of the story was found in Book Eleven of the *Annales Maximi*. Now we know this much for certain about the *Annales* – they were compiled in eighty books and published sometime during the pontificate of P. Mucius Scaevola, for which a median date would be ca. 120 B.C. We do not, of course, know the length of the separate books, but we can assume, since *uolumen* in this sense can only mean a conveniently sized roll, that they were all about the same length. For the earliest period, for which information was sparse, each book (just as with Livy) will have covered a number of years ; the later books fewer years each. Now the *Annales* may have preserved a record of notices from ca. 300 B.C. or, perhaps, from ca. 400 B.C. but it is impossible to believe that Book "Eleven" contained a notice from the fifth century B.C. Equally, it is out of the question that Book Eleven contained a notice later than 150 B.C., leaving sixty-nine books to cover the remaining twenty to thirty years at most until the date of their publication ([143]). Certainty is impossible, but a date in the early to middle third century for Book Eleven of the *Annales* seems quite plausible ([144]).

(142) WALBANK, *Comm. on Polybius*, i, 636 (on POLYB., 6.54, 4-55) ; he is followed by OGILVIE, *Comm. on Livy*, 258.

(143) On the eighty books and their publication, see SERV., *in Aen.*, 1.373 and CIC., *Orat.*, 2.52. It should be noted further that most of the period ca. 150-120 B.C. is very lightly represented in our extant prodigy reports – an indication that there was far too little material to have filled sixty-nine books.

(144) WÜLKER, *op. cit.*, 37, dated the episode to ca. 300 to 250 B.C. though without giving his reasons. Simply for purposes of very rough comparison we might note that Book Eleven of Livy covered events down to 287 B.C. (the *lex Hortensia*), and Book Eleven of Dio's Roman History narrates the First Punic War. (It goes without saying that I am not suggesting any strict correlation – the interminable Dionysius had only reached 443 B.C. in Book Eleven of his work).

It is impossible to enter here into the other vexed questions which the Gellius passage raises. Those who prefer to believe that the statue did not really represent Horatius have suggested Vulcan, or an Etruscan demi-god *Caicles-Caeculus. The association with the story of the proverb which is, indeed, as Gellius says, translated from Hesiod (*Works and*

We may note briefly one further tale. Immediately following his account of the Capitoline head story, Pliny adds another which he implies similarly illustrates both Etruscan perfidy and their ability to capture omens.

> They say that this also happened ; when a terracotta chariot group was being prepared for the roof of that same temple (i.e. of Capitoline Jupiter), it grew in the furnace and once again the omen was retained (*NH* 28. 16).

The story is particularly interesting because it would seem that this chariot group, destined for the roof of Jupiter's temple, must be that one which was dedicated by the Ogulnii in 296 B.C. and included the image of the god who was later to be identified as Summanus (145). It may well be fact that Etruscan artisans were required to supervise the firing of the statue ; this then gave rise to a tale in which haruspices, who, in fact, saved Summanus' head in 278 B.C. were said to have initially tried to capture his power for themselves when the statue was first made by turning to themselves the good omen of its swelling in the furnace.

Thus the anti-haruspicial side of the debate. The pro-haruspicial side is not nearly so well represented. We may note, though, the legendary embellishments to the prodigy of the Alban Lake (146), where, in the versions of Livy and Dionysius, great stress is laid on the agreement between the interpretation given by the old haruspex of Veii and the response of the Pythia. In Livy, the haruspex speaks expressly of his *libri fatales* and of the *disciplina etrusca*. The senators first regard him as an *auctorem leuem, nec satis fidum super tanta re*, but, after his vindication by Delphi, he is held in high esteem and the military tribunes employ him in procurating the prodigy and placating the gods. The propaganda thrust of this tale hardly needs to be emphasized.

An unequivocal contribution to the debate on the Etruscan side is the list of prodigies drawn up by an apologist for the *disciplina*, which Cicero

Days, 266) seems impossible to explain. But the fact that boys were thought to have gone around chanting something might well reflect a lustral procession of *pueri patrimi matrimi*, which would have been included in the annalistic notice. Lustral processions of boys alone are unattested, but those employing various numbers of boys and girls are common – cf., for example, LIVY, 37.3 for 190 B.C. and OBS., 40 for 108 B.C. A reference to *pueri* in a third century notice can, of course, mean children of both sexes. Finally, it seems to me highly unlikely that any haruspex was actually put to death, although there might well have been Romans who would have approved of it.

(145) LIVY, 10.23, 12 and PALMER, *op. cit.*, 145.

(146) LIVY, 5.15 ; cf. DION. HAL., 12.11-15 ; PLUT., *Cam.*, 4 ; CIC., *Diu.*, 1.100 and 2.69.

preserves. We have analyzed its contents above (147). Here it is only necessary to call attention once more to the fact that it was designed to demonstrate the complete reliability of haruspicial *responsa* when tested against decemviral Sibylline oracles whose accuracy is considered to be unimpeachable.

Reference to the *decemuiri* brings us to the question of the relationship between these two priestly groups. A consideration of the evidence will show clearly that whatever may have been the source of the anti-haruspicial "tendenz" which we have just been examining it was not institutional rivalry on the part of the Roman *decemuiri*. Such rivalry has been assumed, in particular, by Bloch and Gagé (148). It is suggested that the haruspices remained an intrusive element at Rome, representing a philosophy of prodigy interpretation that was alien to indigenous Latin conceptions and constituting an institutional threat to the two Roman priesthoods – *pontifices* and *decemuiri* – but especially the latter, whose business also was the expiation of prodigies.

It is true, of course, that there is an identifiable Etruscan style in the handling of prodigies which can be distinguished from older Latin conceptions. But it is also true, as Bloch and Weinstock have shown, that haruspices were eager to adapt their discipline to existing Roman ideas and we find them on several occasions recommending expiations which belong entirely to the *patrius ritus* (149). Bloch identifies the Second Punic War as the period in which, under extreme psychological stress, Romans first turned decisively in favor of the haruspices and their peculiar style of interpretation, which saw the prodigy not as a catastrophe in and of itself, but as a presage of things to come. And he marks this as a significant revolution in Roman religious attitudes.

I will argue below that the Second Punic War does indeed bring haruspices to the fore with increasing frequency precisely because of the military threat to Etruria. But the contrast with the religious orientation of the preceding two generations cannot be drawn as sharply as Bloch suggests. If it is true that haruspices appear by name in our lists only in 278 B.C. and then not again until the Second Punic War, it should be

(147) Above, p. 21 f.

(148) Bloch, *op. cit.*, *passim* and especially 127 f. ; Gagé, *Apollon romain*, *passim*, and especially 204 where he assumes a condition of perpetual rivalry (*concurrence*) between haruspices and *decemuiri*.

(149) For example, 199 B.C. – *supplicatio* ; 65 B.C. – ludi ; 55 A.D. – *lustratio*.

noted that *decemuiri* during the same interval of time appear on only four occasions [150], and pontiffs not at all. We are lacking so much material from the third century that categorical statements can only be advanced with great caution [151].

In any case, members of the decemviral (and pontifical) colleges were first and foremost Roman politicians who understood perfectly the desirability of including the Etruscan *principes* in the process of prodigy expiation, especially at certain critical moments. What they may have privately thought of haruspices is immaterial. Institutional haggling would have been both offensive to the gods and bad politics – equally important considerations to the Roman mind. The "concurrence" which Gagé assumes (rather than proves) between haruspices and *decemuiri* is simply not there. There is, on the contrary, a good deal of evidence of cooperation between the two groups.

Aside from Cicero's list we may note the following certain instances of cooperation. Most particularly, both cooperated in the expiation for androgynes on over a dozen recorded occasions from 207 B.C. [152]. The task of the haruspices was the removal of the monstrum by drowning while the *decemuiri* supervised the ritual procession of maidens, sacrifice, and offerings. In addition we note that in 102 B.C., for some prodigy or prodigies lost in a lacuna in Obsequens' text [153], we read, *urbs aruspicum iussu lustrata ; hostiarum cinis per decemuiros in mare dispersos*. The *hostiae* are presumably those sacrificed in the lustration ordered by the haruspices, and it is interesting to see here that the *decemuiri* dispose of the ashes in the sea – a method of removing contamination which is characteristic of haruspices. In 99 B.C., in response to the observation of two crows fighting in the sky above the comitium, haruspices recommended a sacrifice to Apollo – the patron god of the Sibylline

(150) In 266, 249, 228 and 225 B.C.

(151) It is, in fact, quite likely that the flames which shot from the earth at Cales in 269 B.C. (Oros., 4.4., 1-4) were procurated with the advice of haruspices. This prodigy type was a specialty of theirs ; the *libri fulgurales* classified it as a species of lightning and it is haruspices who procurate it on both of the two later occasions of the prodigy for which a priesthood is specified (Obs., 43 ; Plut., *Sulla*, 6.6.). I will argue below that their presence is also to be detected behind the scenes in connection with the first Roman human sacrifice of 225 B.C.

(152) Below, p. 65 ff. and Appendix E.

(153) Obs., 44. Haupt suggested a lacuna after the first sentence where *nonnula prodigia* have dropped out.

decemuiri (154). There is, in fact, only one certain instance of disagreement between the two groups. In 172 B.C. (155) the Senate summoned both haruspices and *decemuiri* to give advice for the expiation of a night-time storm which had thrown down a *columna rostrata* on the Capitol. The *decemuiri*, after consulting the Books announced that the City should be purified, that a *supplicatio* and *obsecratio* be held, that victims be sacrificed on the Capitolium and on the Promunturium Minervae in Campania, and that games for ten days be performed for Jupiter. Livy notes *ea omnia cum cura facta*. At the same time, Livy is able to tell us that the haruspices replied *in bonum uersurum id prodigium* – that it portended an extension of boundaries and destruction of enemies because the *rostra* had been enemy spoils. Clearly, the senate took note of their advice as well, and undoubtedly welcomed this good omen on the eve of the war with Perseus. The episode is often cited as an example of cross-purposes between the two priesthoods and is made to bear far more weight than it should. All we are permitted to gather from Livy's account is that the senate consulted both groups of experts and heeded both ; it seems unnecessary to read competition and acrimony into the episode.

Finally we note that certain sacred books attributed to the Etruscan prophetess Vegoia (who had some connection with lightning lore) were stored together with the reconstructed Sibylline Books (and the oracles of the Marcii) in the Augustan temple of Apollo (156). It seems excessively cautious to deny that they had belonged to the earlier Capitoline collection, which need not have entirely perished in the fire of 83. If Augustus' purpose was, as Suetonius says, to eliminate dubious oracles from the collection, he will hardly have been the one to include Books of Vegoia unless they had already gained an established place there.

We are justified in concluding that the *decemuiri*, whose task it was in general to supervise foreign cults in the City, were the patrons and collaborators of the haruspices from the beginning of their involvement with the apparatus of Roman religion (157).

(154) OBS., 46.

(155) LIVY, 42.20, 1-6.

(156) SERV., *ad Aen.*, 6.72 (cf. AMM. MARC, 17.10, 2).

(157) An additional indication of some institutional relationship between the two groups is now provided by the new fragment from Tarquinii published by Torelli (*op. cit.*, 108, 133), dated to sometime in the first century, earlier than 51 B.C. (*sub decemuiros ea discipulin[a relata est]*). Unfortunately, it is impossible to understand exactly what is meant.

V. PRODIGIES AND THE SUPPORT OF ETRUSCAN MORALE

We turn now to a consideration of the evidence for our thesis that haruspicial activity at Rome is noticeably pronounced precisely at moments when some crisis to Etruria – or, more to the point, to Rome via Etruria – threatened. Etruria stood between Rome and a succession of invaders from the north : Gauls, Carthaginians, Cimbri and Teutons. If the *principes* of the Etruscan cities deserted their allegiance the danger to Rome would be immeasurably greater. It was, therefore, essential to Rome to discover ways of reenforcing this allegiance and of assuaging Etruscan anxieties at times of actual or anticipated invasion. Reassurance, as we will see, took the form of attention to Etruscan religious sensibilities – acknowledgement of their prodigies, incorporation of elements of Etruscan expiatory and apotropaic ritual, and a degree of visible deference to the high-born haruspices and their science.

On three occasions – 225, 216, and 114 B.C. – the Sibylline Books commanded that the Romans bury alive male and female pairs of Gauls and Greeks in the Forum Boarium ([158]). Neither the origin nor purpose of Roman human sacrifice has been established with certainty. It is at least clear that it was not an indigenous or old Roman ritual. Aside from Livy's disclaimer, *minime Romano sacro*, which we might otherwise ignore, there can be little doubt that it was not practiced before 225 B.C. and, after two subsequent occurrences, it was outlawed by a *senatus consultum* of 97 B.C. ([159]).

(158) For 225 B.C., the principal account is PLUT., *Marc.*, 3.4 (OROS., 4.13, 3 adds nothing). DIO (in ZON., 8.9) apparently dated the sacrifice to 228 B.C. but this is incorrect ; as Plutarch makes clear, the sacrifice is closely tied to the outbreak of the war, that is, of the Insubrian invasion of 225 B.C.

For 216 B.C., LIVY, 22.57, 2-6 provides the only full account (*Per.*, 22 and PLUT., *Fabius*, 18 mention the scandal of the Vestals but not the sacrifice).

For 114 B.C., PLUT., *QR*, 83 is the principal account. OBS., 37, LIVY, *Per.*, 63, OROS, 5.20-22, and DIO, 26, frag. 87 all describe the attendant circumstances and provide a date for the episode but do not mention the sacrifice itself.

(159) LIVY, 22.57, 6 ; PLINY, *NH*, 30.3, 12. Despite the abolition of this sacrifice, PLINY, *NH*, 28.12 reports that his own generation had witnessed it and implies that he had read

On the latter two occasions it appears to be firmly associated by both Livy and Plutarch with the execution of unchaste Vestals, but on the first occasion it is not. There it is clear that the sacrifice was performed in response to the great Gallic invasion of that year as both Plutarch and the oracle quoted by Dio make plain ([160]). Despite the apparent association of the latter occurrences with the Vestals, it is possible to suggest there too a more plausible connection with the Gauls. Hannibal's army included large numbers of Gaulish tribesmen. At Cannae in particular they did good service on the Carthaginian side and suffered heavy casualties ([161]). Indeed, the Hannibalic invasion must have seemed to the Romans a kind of *tumultus Gallicus*. In 114 B.C. a Gaulish tribe, the Scordisci, heavily defeated a Roman army under the consul M. Porcius Cato in Macedonia and pillaged Greece as far south as Delphi ([162]). It may be questioned whether a Gaulish victory in Macedonia could have been viewed from Rome as a *tumultus Gallicus* in any sense, but the specific threat to Delphi is perhaps likely to have activated the Apollonian *decemuiri*.

If *metus Gallicus* motivated the sacrifice on all three occasions, it is difficult to see how Livy and Plutarch came to see it mistakenly as an expiation for the unchastity and execution of Vestal Virgins. The explanation can only lie in the fact that live inhumation was a feature common to both ; and it had so happened that the two events had coincided on two occasions. But certainly, the connection that they draw between the two is fallacious. It is, in the first place, not obvious why sacrifice of Gauls and Greeks should be an appropriate atonement for the execution of Vestals. Further, Vestals were buried alive by the pontiffs at the Colline Gate, Gauls and Greeks by the *decemuiri* across the city in the

the *precatio* with which the *Magister* of the XVviral college initiated the rite. This is inexplicable unless, as seems most likely, he is referring to a unique action by Caligula recorded by SUETONIUS (*Gaius*, 29.2) : *Gallis Graecisque aliquot uno tempore condemnatis gloriabatur Gallograeciam se subegisse*. Whatever Caligula's purpose may have been (and this is only one example of his interest in the more exotic aspects of Roman religion) no *senatusconsultum* would have stood in his way (so CICHORIUS, *Röm. Stud.* [1922], 7 ff.).

(160) CICHORIUS, *ibid.*, attempted to relate the first sacrifice also to a scandal among the Vestals by accepting Dio's higher date for the sacrifice (n. 158, above) and then redating to 228 the condemnation of the Vestal, Tuccia noted in Livy *Per.*, 20 and dated there to 230 B.C. (preceding the reference to the First Illyrian War in 229). Cichorius' strained chronology is not acceptable.

(161) POLYB., 3.113 ff.

(162) LIVY, *Per.*, 63 ; FLORUS, 1.39, 4 ; DIO, 26, frag. 88 ; FESTUS, *Breu.*, 9, 1 ; AMM. MARC, 27.4, 4. Festus significantly calls the disaster *simile prodigio*.

Forum Boarium. In addition, Livy's own attitude is revealing. He is not shocked by the burial of the Vestals (*uti mos est*) whereas he is plainly shocked by the sacrifice of the Gauls and Greeks. The difference is obvious – the one is dictated by the *patrius ritus*, the other is not. Finally, a human sacrifice of atonement is not associated with any earlier instance of the execution of Vestals (163).

If we can be satisfied that the purpose of the sacrifice was the magical aversion of Gaulish invasion, the question of its origin still remains. The Romans were acquainted with three major foreign peoples (to say nothing of lesser tribes) who practiced human sacrifice in some form : Etruscans, Gauls, and Carthaginians. Unfortunately the live inhumation practiced by the Romans does not correspond to any known method of human sacrifice of any of these peoples.

No one, to my knowledge has suggested a Punic origin for the rite. Palmer has argued for Gaulish origin (164), but it is difficult to believe that any similarity between the Roman and Gaulish rites could have escaped the attention of ancient ethnographers who are particularly informative on Druidic practices. Nor does a Gaulish origin account well for what is certainly the most peculiar and striking element – the sacrifice of Greeks (165).

An Etruscan origin for the rite has been assumed by nearly all students of the question – though not always, to be sure, for the most cogent reasons (166). As with the Gauls, inhumation of live victims is not an attested form of Etruscan human sacrifice, although other, and bloodier,

(163) See LIVY, 2.42, 10 and DION. HAL., 8.89, 3-5 for 483 B.C. and DION HAL., 9.40, 1-4 for 472 B.C. This is the conclusion also of C. BÉMONT, "Les enterrés vivants du Forum Boarium", *Mélanges d'Arch. et d'Hist.*, 72 (1960), 133-146.

(164) PALMER, *op. cit.*, 153 ff.

(165) GAGÉ, *op. cit.*, 250, attempts to dispose of the Greeks by postulating a confusion in the sources deriving from the use of the name 'Gallograeci' in a Sibylline oracle. But he admits that this name is not found in Latin earlier than 56 B.C., and it is most improbable that it can have been coined as early as 225 B.C. to denote the still un-hellenized Galatians of Asia Minor. The Greeks must stay.

(166) The Etruscan origin is argued on various grounds by, for example, F. SCHWENN, "Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern", *Religionsgesch. Vers. u. Vorarbeiten*, 15, 3 (1915), 148 ff. ; C. CICHORIUS, *loc. cit.* ; A. GRENIER, *La religion étrusque* (Paris, 1948) ; J. GAGÉ, *op. cit.*, 243 ; C. BÉMONT, *art. cit.* ; P. FABRÉ, "Minime Romano Sacro", *REA*, 42 (1940), 419-24 ; K. LATTE, *RR*, 256-57 ; R. BLOCH, "Les origines étrusques des Livres Sibyllins", *Mélanges Ernout* (Paris, 1940), 21-28. Bloch's argument from the hypothesis of early Etruscan influence on the archaic strata of the Sibylline Books seems not to the point since the sacrifice is clearly not archaic.

methods are well attested (167). The sacrifice of Greeks by Romans seems inexplicable unless it was required by a fixed form of ritual. Only the Etruscans, who, throughout their early history, fought repeatedly against both peoples, are likely to have evolved a ritual for success in war in which representatives of both peoples were sacrificed as a means of magically attacking the dual enemy (168).

In fact, we have an account of the sacrifice of Greeks by Etruscans in Herodotus (*Histories* 1.167) who tells us that Phocaean prisoners taken by the Caeritans after the battle of Alalia in 535 B.C. were stoned to death and,

> the result of this outrage was that when any living thing – sheep, ox, or man – subsequently passed the place where the murdered Phocaeans lay, its body became twisted and crippled by a paralytic stroke. Wishing to expiate the crime of the murder, the men of Agylla (i.e. Caere) sent to Delphi and were told by the priestess to begin the custom, which they still observe today, of honoring the dead men with a grand funeral ceremony and the holding of athletic and equestrian contests. (Tr. A. de Selincourt).

In view of known Etruscan propensities, it is hard to see the stoning of the Phocaeans as anything but a human sacrifice, precisely similar to an atrocity which they committed against the Romans in 358 B.C. (169). But what is particularly interesting in the passage is the information that Delphi (with whom Caere was establishing relations at approximately this time) enforced upon the Caeritans an annual rite of atonement (and perhaps also of propitiation for the ghosts of the victims who still remained dangerously within the city) which was still being celebrated in Herodotus' day, a century later. With this we must compare the remark of Plutarch that in his day, annually in the month of November, secret rites were still being performed in Rome for the Gauls and Greeks who had been sacrificed in 225 (170). Perhaps Herodotus exaggerates Delphi's role ; if so, then the rites of atonement or propitiation are a native Etruscan conception. But in either case the resemblance of the Roman and Etruscan

(167) J. Heurgon, *Daily Life of the Etruscans* (New York, 1964), 210 ff. ; Grenier, *op. cit.*, 65-66. I am not persuaded by A. J. Pfiffig's argument to the contrary (*Religio Etrusca* [Graz, 1975], 110).

(168) The point is made also by Latte, *RR*, 257.

(169) Livy (7.15, 10) relates that in 358 B.C. the army of Fabius Ambustus was defeated by the Tarquinians who *trecentos septem milites Romanos captos ... immolarunt*.

(170) Plut., *Marc.*, 3.

observance of annual atonement for the victims of sacrifice is, I believe another (and hitherto unnoticed) indication of Etruscan origin for the Roman rite.

The date of the first Roman sacrifice takes on significance when we note that the great Gaulish invasion of 225 was the first in which Etruria was the battleground *and* was a Roman ally [171]. The Insubres, Boii, and Gaesatae invaded and ravaged Etruria and Polybius emphasizes both the terror felt throughout Italy and the alacrity with which the allied contingents joined the Roman forces [172]. But despite the Etruscans' contributions to the general defense doubts may still have been entertained initially about their loyalties. They had not been so tested since 282 and at that time they had fought alongside the invading Gauls. Under the circumstances, the performance of an ancient war sacrifice which Etruscans recognized as their own might have commended itself to the Romans as a valuable gesture to Etruscan sentiment (as well as, of course, hopefully being good magic).

The *decemuiri* will have had to participate in this assessment, however, and so it is worth noting that M. Aemilius Numida was at this time Magister of the decemviral college [173], and a kinsman of the consul, L. Aemilius Papus who had supreme command over the Roman defense. Just as we will observe below in the case of Livius Salinator during the crisis of 207, sensitivity to the exigencies of the military situation is closely joined to the religious authority to initiate a response tailored to the crisis.

Haruspices nowhere appear in our notices of the sacrifices of 225 (or 216) [174], but it seems reasonable to suppose that they played a role in

(171) Our principal source for the Gaulish invasions of the third century is Polybius (2.19-20). The last Gaulish incursion through Etruria before 225 was the Lake Vadimo campaign of 283-282 B.C. In that war, Gauls and Etruscans fought on the same side (it was, in fact, Etruria's last bid to avoid Roman subjugation). In 236, the Transalpine tribes made an abortive raid down the Adriatic coast as far as Ariminum, but Etruria was untouched. There was no subsequent incursion until the Telamon campaign of 225.

(172) Polyb., 2.22-31.

(173) He held the office from at least 236 B.C. until 211. *Fast Cap.*, Degrassi, p. 62 f., 142, and *MRR*, p. 277, n. 11. The Aemilii were a prominent decemviral family. In addition to Aemilius Numida, Aemilian *decemuiri* are attested in 211, 172, 143, and 31 B.C. (see *MRR sub ann.*). At the same time we may be justified in seeing some positive connections between them and the haruspices ; one of the few haruspices whose names are known to us from the literary record was one Aemilius Potensis (Obs., 44).

(174) They do, of course, appear in 114 to interpret the prodigy of Helvia, but that prodigy, and the *incestum* of the Vestals which it foretold, has no genuine relation of the human sacrifice of that year, despite what Plutarch thought.

recommending a native Etruscan rite to the Senate. As foreigners, however, they could not perform sacrifice in Rome. This would necessarily fall to the *decemuiri* and their action would have to be preceded by one of their own Sibylline oracles, which they produced for the occasion. We will see precisely the same process below in the androgyne expiation of 207 where haruspices expressly put in train a series of ritual acts which are performed by pontiffs and *decemuiri*.

It is not necessary to argue that the human sacrifice of 216 B.C. was directed specifically at Etruscan sentiment. The rite had "worked" in 225 and the Romans will have needed no more reason than this to resort to it again in the panic following Cannae. Similarly in 114 B.C. By now the sacrifice had become an automatic response to Gaulish victories, though one which, it would seem, many Romans – more Hellenized than their grandfathers had been – were becoming uncomfortable with, because it was never again repeated.

The next notable instance of Roman adaptation of Etruscan ritual occurred in 207 B.C. when, on the eve of Hasdrubal's invasion, we find the haruspices playing a major role in one of the most interesting and most fully documented expiatory rites preserved in our sources.

After reports had reached Rome of Hasdrubal's approach through Gaul to the Alps, but before the new consuls, M. Livius Salinator and C. Claudius Nero, had left the city, there were reports of a number of prodigies from various places beginning with a rain of stones at Veii ([175]). After these had received the standard expiations (*hostiae maiores, supplicatio, nouemdiale sacrum*), it was reported that at Frusino a baby had been born the size of a four year old child and of indeterminate sex ("just as had happened at Sinuessa two years earlier", Livy explains). Haruspices were thereupon summoned from Etruria and, declaring the prodigy vile and disgusting, recommended that it be cast out from Roman territory and drowned in the sea. They, themselves, put it alive in a chest, carried it out to sea and threw it in.

At the same time, the pontiffs further decreed that thrice nine maidens should go through the city chanting a hymn. But, while the maidens were learning their hymn (which had been composed by the poet Livius Andronicus) in the temple of Juppiter Stator, the temple of Juno Regina on the Aventine was struck by lightning.

(175) Livy, 27.36, 1-4.

The haruspices, being consulted a second time, declared that this prodigy pertained to the matrons and that the goddess should be placated with a gift. To implement this, the curule aediles supervised a meeting of the matrons at which contributions were made for a golden bowl which was duly presented to the goddess.

Immediately thereafter (*confestim*) a day was proclaimed by the *decemuiri* for another sacrifice to the goddess at which they conducted a procession of thrice nine virgins, singing Andronicus' hymn, throughout the city, terminating finally at Juno's temple on the Aventine where two white cows were sacrificed and two cypress wood statues were offered to her.

This complex of rituals is unique in being the only example preserved in our sources of the simultaneous activity of pontiffs, haruspices, *decemuiri*, and aediles ; and scholars have been drawn to attempt analyses of their respective roles and the motivations which lay behind them. In particular, Boyce and Gagé (who follows her analysis closely) [176] have seen in this succession of rites an example of competition and cross purposes between haruspices and aediles on the one hand and *decemuiri* on the other, with pontiffs playing a somewhat ambiguous role between them. Why this should have been the case is never made clear except by general references to the "frantic public mind" [177] which turned this way and that, seeking solace from a succession of priestly authorities, or to a presumed hereditary antipathy between haruspices and *decemuiri*, abetted, in this instance, by an unexplained preference of the pontiffs and the aristocracy in general for the former [178].

Both studies commit a fundamental error in failing to appreciate that technical decisions on the proper expiation of prodigies were not made by the frantic public mind, nor were they initiated *ad hoc* by ambitious rival priesthoods. These decisions were made by the Senate after all relevant advice had been heard and considered [179]. What kind of bargaining may have gone into such decisions we will never know, but we can take it as certain that what emerged was a coherent plan to which all the participants adhered. Such a plan will have allowed not only for religious

(176) Aline A. Boyce, "The Expiatory Rites of 207 B.C.", *TAPA*, 68 (1937), 157-171 ; Gagé, *op. cit.*, 349 ff.

(177) Boyce's phrase, *art. cit.*, 160.

(178) Gagé, *op. cit.*, 358, 361.

(179) Wülker, *op. cit.*, 38.

considerations, but also, as in cases such as this one, for pressing political considerations as well ([180]).

During the earlier years of the war haruspices appear in our sources only once, in 214 B.C. But prodigies from Tarquinii in 210 (the first reported from any federate Etruscan city), and from Volsinii and Caere in 208, as well as a report of a swarm of bees from Cassinum in that year (a prodigy necessarily handled by haruspices) may indicate an acknowledgement in Rome of growing unrest in Etruria in the years immediately preceding the events of 207 ([181]). Livy documents Roman fears of disloyalty in Etruria from 212 on – particularly at Arretium, where the children of the local nobility had to be taken as hostages for their good behavior ([182]). The immediate cause of unrest in Etruria between 210 and 207 was the approach of Hasdrubal ([183]). At least some members of the Etruscan upper class were prepared to take advantage of Carthaginian help in freeing themselves from Roman dominion, and Livy notes that, "the whole Senate was convinced that the consuls ought to take the field as soon as possible for they must confront Hasdrubal as he came down from the Alps lest he raise Cisalpine Gaul or Etruria which was already on tiptoe for rebellion" ([184]).

(180) It is to the credit of Jean Cousin, ("La crise religieuse de 207 av. J.-C.", *Rev. d'Hist. des Religions*, 26 [1942], 15-41) to have resisted Boyce's exciting vision of confusion and cross-purposes. His summary of the rites, "actes successifs d'une drame collectif", could not be better put. Much of his article, however, is taken up with speculation on the symbolism of the Porta Carmentalis, the Vicus Iugarius, and the cypress statues, and he ultimately fails to grasp the political point of the rituals.

(181) Livy, 24.10, 6-13 (for 214); 27.4, 11-15 (for 210); 27.23, 1-4 (for 208).

(182) Beginning in 212 B.C. two legions were stationed permanently in Etruria, presumably with a view to discouraging rebellion. Late in 209, the propraetor, C. Calpurnius, reported the first signs of disaffection from Arretium, and the consul-designate, Marcellus, was despatched there with orders, if necessary to "transfer the war from Apulia to Etruria" (Livy, 27.21, 6-7). In 208, Hostilius Tubulus took one hundred and twenty children of Arretine senators hostage, and, while Terentius Varro held the town with one legion, he took precautions throughout Etruria against revolutionary outbreaks. It is clear from Livy's account that not only Arretium but all of Etruria was suspect, and, in fact, Zonaras speaks of some Etruscans actually rebelling in 208 (9.91). It is, of course, notorious that the Etruscan cavalry were the first to desert Marcellus later this year in the skirmish at Petelia (Plut., *Marc.*, 29).

(183) For a discussion of the background to Etruscan unrest, see D. W. L. Van Son, "The Disturbances in Etruria during the Second Punic War", *Mnemos.*, ser. 4, v. 16 (1963), 267-274. He emphasizes the anxiety that may have attended the inauguration of a new Etruscan *saeculum*.

(184) Livy, 27.38, 6.

It is in the context of Rome's concern for Etruscan loyalty that the prominence given to the haruspices in 207 finds its explanation.

There is only one earlier notice of an androgyne in our lists ; in 209 B.C. *Sinuessae natum ambiguo inter marem ac feminam sexu infantem, quos androgynos uulgus, ut pleraque, faciliore ad duplicanda uerba Graeco sermone appellat* ([185]). So far as Livy's notice for that year reveals, this prodigy was not singled out for any special form of expiation ; it and nine other prodigies were expiated "en masse" by sacrifice, *supplicatio*, and *obsecratio* (with no indication of the officiating priesthood). Despite the near impossibility of believing that androgynous births had not been viewed as prodigious by the Romans from time immemorial, it is clear from the way in which Livy pauses to comment on the word *androgynus* and from his reference back to this prodigy at its second occurrence that he had not previously recorded such an event in the missing books of the second decade. At any rate, it is only in 207 B.C. that the prodigy is for the first time singled out for extraordinary expiation ; an expiation, moreover, with Etruscan content. The disposal by drowning, or other means, of a *monstrum* (an animal or human which is anomalous either by physiognomy or behavior) is an exclusively Etruscan technique ([186]). We can be certain that the treatment of androgynes from 207 on by drowning alive in a chest is a unique haruspicial contribution ([187]).

It seems, then, that in 207 B.C. the haruspices were imposing on the senate their view of the prodigious nature of androgynes and the correct expiation for them.

But this can only have taken place with the concurrence of pontiffs and *decemuiri* and the senate in general. We can, in fact, illustrate a set of specific relationships among these groups in this year which should place

(185) Livy, 27.11, 4-5.

(186) The certain examples, other than androgynes, are : Obs., 57 (83 B.C.) – a serpent born by a woman is thrown into the river ; Phlegon, frag., 54 (112 A.D.) – a two-headed child is thrown into the Tiber ; Livy, 36.37, 2 (191 B.C.) – two strangely behaving oxen are burned and their ashes thrown into the Tiber ; Obs., 25 (136 B.C.) – a multi-limbed child is cremated and his ashes thrown into the sea ; Pliny, *NH*, 7.36 (171 B.C.) – a girl who turned into a boy before her parents eyes (possibly a case of late-detected hermaphroditism, though not classified as such) was deported to a desert island.

(187) I am not persuaded by Gagé's attempt to trace a connection to the Roman punishment for *parracidium* (*op. cit.*, 208 f.). It is interesting to note (without committing ourselves to any theory of Etruscan "origins") that the Babylonian method of disposing of an animalous birth is also by drowning. See Erle Leichty, "Teratological Omens", in *La Divination en Mésopotamie ancienne* (Strasbourg, 1966), 131-39.

the matter of their cooperation beyond question. M. Livius Salinator (cos. II, 207 B.C.) had been placed in overall command of the defense against Hasdrubal, and he was necessarily sensitive to the potential danger posed by disaffection in Etruria should Hasdrubal choose (just as Hannibal earlier) to take the western route into Italy (188). (Later, after the Roman victory at Metaurus, it was Livius who was sent to Etruria to investigate whatever acts of treachery the Etruscans were thought to have committed) (189). But at the same time Livius was a senior member, if not still Magister, of the decemviral college (190). It was, of course, his client, Livius Andronicus, who composed the hymn which the twenty-seven maidens chanted in the decemviral procession which expiated the androgyne (191). Further, his son, C. Livius Salinator (cos. 188 B.C.) was, in 207, a pontiff of five years' standing (192). Finally, a pontifical colleague of Caius', Cn. Servilius Caepio, was also, in that year, one of the two curule aediles who supervised the convocation of the matrons and their offering to Juno Regina (193).

We are led to the conclusion that the consul, faced with the possibility of having to fight Hasdrubal in the vicinity of Arretium which (to say nothing of the rest of Etruria) was in a state of virtual rebellion, was instrumental in marshalling his client, his college, his son's college, and

(188) LIVY, 27.35, 10. In the event, of course, Hasdrubal took the Adratic route through Picenum. But, at the moment that the androgyne expiations took place, it was not yet clear which route he would choose. Livius was prepared for either contingency – having stationed himself at Narnia from where he could move in either direction to support the Roman forward positions at Arretium or Ariminum. On the strategy of the campaign, see H. H. SCULLARD, *Roman World*, 217.

(189) LIVY, 28.10, 4-5.

(190) That Livius had earlier, at least, been one of the two *Magistri* of the college has now been established by PALMER (*op. cit.*, 95 ff.). The M. Livius Salinator, who is recorded as one of the two Magistri at the celebration of the Ludi Saeculares in 236 B.C. (*Fast. Cap.*, fr. xlix, Degrassi, p. 62 f., 142) lacks identity unless he is equated with the consul of 219 and 207. The span of time is no impediment to the identification – the other *Magister* of 236, M. Aemilius Numida, lived until 211 B.C. Whether Livius' period of self-imposed exile (218-210) interrupted his tenure of the magistracy, or whether this office in any event, typically rotated within the college, is uncertain. At any rate, he will still have been a *decemuir*, and one of very long standing, in 207 B.C.

(191) On Andronicus and his relation to Livius, see PALMER, *op. cit.*, 94 ff. in addition to the standard reference works.

(192) See MÜNZER, "Livius", no. 29 in *RE*, 25 (1926) on the filiation of the pontiff to the consul of 207 (= no. 33). Münzer did not recognize the identity of the consul with the *Magister* (no. 32).

(193) Caepio was a pontiff from 213 to 174 B.C. (see *MRR*, s. ann., 213 and 207).

the curule aediles in a carefully orchestrated series of impressive religious performances around a prodigy whose definition the haruspices provided and in the expiation of which they were invited to play a major and visible role. Their contribution was not confined simply to identifying and disposing of the *monstrum* in the method prescribed by their Books. The focus of both the subsequent matronal and virginal processions was Juno Regina, the Etruscan Juno of Veii.

Despite Boyce, Gagé, and Cousin (194), it seems likely that Juno's temple was, from the very beginning, the intended goal of the procession which the pontiffs authorized and the *decemuiri* conducted. The hymn to Juno was being rehearsed in the temple of Jupiter Stator because there existed a cult connection between these two deities (195). The lightning bolt which subsequently struck Juno's temple (or, we may suppose, came close enough to striking it during a thunder storm) was presumably an example of the *fulmen consiliarium*, a species of lightning which (as Seneca informs us in his discussion of Etruscan fulgural science) (196) confirms a contemplated decision – in this case the creation of an elaborate new ritual around the figure of Juno. But every lightning bolt must also be expiated, and this afforded an opportunity for a performance of a preliminary procession of the matrons, suggested by the haruspices and effected by the aediles, while the principal, pontifical-decemviral procession of the maidens was still in preparation (197).

The choice of Juno Regina may well have had several determinants. Gagé stresses her importance as protectress of the sexual-biological order

(194) Boyce, *art. cit.*, 161 ; Gagé, *op. cit.*, 358 ; Cousin, *art. cit.*, 22-23.

(195) See Pliny, *NH*, 36.42-43 who relates an anecdote designed to explain why a pair of temples – one to Juppiter Stator and one to Juno Regina – dedicated by Metellus Macedonicus in 146 B.C. seemed to possess one another's cult statues. Undoubtedly some sort of association existed between the two, and, although it may only be demonstrable for the temples built in 146, we needn't doubt that it was older than that.

(196) Seneca, *NQ*, 39, 1 : *Genera fulgurum tria esse ait Caecina, consiliarium, auctoritatis, et quod status dicitur. Consiliarium ante rem fit sed post cogitationem, cum aliquid in animo uersantibus aut suadetur fulminis ictu aut dissuadetur.* Cf. Amm. Marc., 23.5, 12-13.

(197) In subsequent androgyne expiations (all of them narrated far more briefly than this one) we hear no more of the aediles, or, for that matter, of the pontiffs. But Boyce is incorrect in saying (p. 171) that the matronal procession, having no essential relation to the androgyne, is not met with again. The matrons appear in the androgyne expiation of 125 B.C. although by that time, to be sure, the ritual has gone through considerable reshaping (see Appendix E for a discussion of the later history of the ritual).

and, thus, her appropriateness for the expiation of an anomalous birth. We may certainly accept this in part, but the aspect of birth goddess is common to all Junos. I suggest that the overwhelming consideration in the choice of Aventine Juno in 207 (as, indeed, in 218 and 217 when she received offerings although no anomalous births had occurred) was due to her identity – still strongly felt – as an Etruscan war goddess ([198]).

It is not possible, of course, to gauge the effectiveness of this dramatic ritual on Etruscan morale. Etruria was not finally put to the test, though acts of disloyalty apparently still occurred. But we may take it that the ritual seemed at the time, to Livius and others, well worth the effort if it enhanced the *dignitas* of Etruscan haruspices and elevated an Etruscan goddess who, judging from our records, had gone unattended with ceremony for a decade, to a new pinnacle of importance.

On one further occasion in the Republican period Rome was genuinely frightened by the prospect of invasion from the north. This, of course, was the invasion of the Teutones and Cimbri who, as they drew closer to the northern and eastern flanks of the Roman empire, inflicted a series of defeats on Roman generals culminating in October, 105 B.C. in the disaster at Arausio, the worst Roman defeat since Cannae. Beginning late in 103, the tribes, which had temporarily separated, combined in southern France to launch an attack on Italy which, following the path of nearly all previous barbarian invasions, would have carried them through Etruria to the gates of Rome ([199]).

Although we are forced now to rely for prodigy information almost entirely on the meager and defective notices of Obsequens, a reflection of the military crisis of these years may be detectable in the prodigy lists where the incidence of prodigies in Etruscan cities and the activity of haruspices seem to signal anxiety in Etruria – the intended target of invasion.

(198) On the military-political aspect of Juno Regina and other Junos, see PALMER, *op. cit.*, Ch. I. On the *euocatio* of Juno from Veii in 396 B.C., LIVY, 6. 21-23, 7 and OGILVIE, *Comm.*, 673.

(199) The Teutones and Ambrones advanced down the Rhone, intending to follow the southern coast of Gaul and enter Italy by the north-west. The Cimbri, meanwhile, crossed the Alps by the Brenner pass and, advancing down the Adige, drove Lutatius Catulus back from Tridentum. They were defeated the following year by Marius and Catulus at Vercellae, considerably to the west of Tridentum ; they too, were evidently aiming to follow the western route into Italy. The Tigurini were, perhaps, intending to take the Adriatic route (*CAH*, ix, 139 ff.).

Obsequens' lists for 104 and 102 B.C. are both marred by lacunae and are difficult to interpret. We can, nevertheless, extract enough information from them to document the unusual activity of haruspices in these years.

The panic which followed Arausio, late in 105, we should expect to find reflected in the list for 104, assuming, as was typically the case, that those prodigies were reported and expiated at the beginning of the next consular year, which began not long after the defeat. Obsequens 43 is a complex list comprising a series of eight prodigies followed by a brief notice of expiation and then another series of ten prodigies with another brief notice of expiation. Since there is no separate entry for 103, it is more than likely (as Wülker suggested) that two years have been combined here. If so, then the alarm felt in Etruria in 104 can be detected in the following year as well. The north Etruscan town of Luna (a Roman colony since 177) appears in the first series. The second includes Volsinii, where flames shot from the earth – a characteristically haruspicial prodigy, and Tarquinii, where rivers of milk bubbled up from the ground. In both expiations only haruspices are named. In the first instance, following a reported sighting of *arma caelestia* battling in the sky (200), we read, *aruspicum responso populus stipem Cereri et Proserpinae tulit ; uirgines uiginti septem dona canentes tulerunt* (201). Of the second expiation, following the Tarquinian prodigy, we read *aruspicum responso signa oleagina duo armata statuta supplicatumque*, which calls to mind the two cypress wood statues that were dedicated to Juno Regina in 207 B.C.

Obsequens 44 for 102 B.C. continues to reveal anxiety in Etruria and among the haruspices themselves at Rome. Presumably it reflects the situation either before Marius' victory at Aquae Sextiae or after Catulus' retreat from Tridentum. The list begins, *in Tuscis lapidibus pluerat.* Lack of reference to a specific Etruscan city is almost unparalleled (202). Perhaps rains of stones were reported from so many cities in this year that Obsequens, or the epitome which he used, simplified the entry. The rain

(200) This was reported from Ameria and Tuder in Umbria. The locale, missing in Obsequens, can be supplied from Plut., *Marius*, 17, 4.

(201) It is more than likely that a lacuna conceals mention of an androgyne for which this expiation seems appropriate. See Appendix E, p. 131.

(202) For 223 B.C., Dio, 12 (Zon, 8.20, 4) records a prodigy simply from Etruria, and Orosius (4.13, 12) locates the same prodigy *apud Tuscos*.

of stones was expiated by the traditional *nouemdiale sacrum* and then we are told, *urbs aruspicum iussu lustrata. hostiarum cinis per decemuiros in mare dispersos, et per dies nouem per magistratus circa omnia templa et municipia pompa ducta supplicantum.* We have already noted this expiation as one of those in which haruspices and *decemuiri* evidently cooperated and in which the *decemuiri*, in fact, perform an act otherwise attested only for haruspices (203). We may add here that a *supplicatio* of nine days is unprecedented. What prodigy prompted this extraordinary expiation is unclear. Probably, as Haupt suggested, one or more prodigies preceding it in the text have been lost (204).

Obsequens' notice continues with prodigies from Rome (a swarm of bees to which haruspices presumably reacted, though Obsequens omits mention of it), Latium, Gallia, Aricia, and, finally, this extraordinary notice, *aedes Iouis + clusa fulmine icta. cuius expiationem, quia primus monstrauerat, Aemilius Potensis aruspex praemium tulit, ceteris celantibus, quod ipsis liberisque exitium portenderetur* (205). Some drama lies behind this cryptic notice which we may never penetrate. At the very least, it is clear that the haruspices were extraordinarily exercised about something. Possibly their anxiety, whatever its specific source, was accentuated by dread of the approaching end of the eighth Etruscan *saeculum*. But it is the most economical hypothesis to relate their behavior, and the unprecedented act of rewarding one of them, to Roman and Etruscan fears – perhaps of the Teutones, if the episode occurred before Aquae Sextiae, otherwise of the Cimbri to whom Catulus' retreat had opened the road to Etruria.

If we have been correct in suggesting that the religious response to military threats to Etruria becomes pronounced at times when the crisis is coupled with Roman misgivings about the steadfastness of Etruscan *principes*, then the prodigy material of the years 104-102 B.C. may also be seen against such a background. There is some reason to think that throughout the whole period from the first agrarian law of Ti. Gracchus in 133 B.C. down to the Social War the *principes* of Etruria had been feeling and expressing serious dissatisfaction over the prospect of losing a portion of their lands to agrarian redistribution. This unrest, and the

(203) Above, p. 58.

(204) H. HAUPT, *Animadversiones in Iulii Obsequentis Prodigiorum Librum* (Budissae, 1881).

(205) For the corrupt + *clusa*, Heinsius suggested Clusii.

Senate's acknowledgement of it, quite apart from any additional crisis of foreign invasion, appears to be reflected in some religious phenomena of the period.

The question of the motivation of the Italians in the Social War – in particular their attitude toward the citizenship and agrarian legislation of the tribune Livius Drusus in 91 B.C., is notoriously vexed. But Appian's account of the years 91-90, though highly compressed, states clearly that the *Italiotae* welcomed Drusus' citizenship bill but at the same time resented the colonial bill which would take from them, as the price of citizenship, large amounts of hitherto undivided *ager publicus*, to be given, by way of conciliation, to the Roman plebs. The Etruscans and Umbrians, Appian tells us, shared with other Italians this apprehension over losing their lands and, late in 91, they were brought to the city by the consuls – ostensibly to complain about Drusus' law, but really to kill him, and they shouted down the law publicly while they waited for the day of its *δοκιμασία* (206). Etruscans and Umbrians, then, were evidently particularly opposed to having to give up *ager publicus* in exchange for citizenship (207). And if Appian's statement that the Romans typically siezed part of the land of conquered peoples is accurate, then we should assume that there was perhaps a fair amount of *ager publicus* in Etruria – most of it, no doubt, still in the hands of the powerful landowners (208).

(206) APPIAN, *BC*, 1.35-36. The difficulties in Appian's compressed narrative have allowed for differences of opinion as to precisely which law, or bill, the Etruscans and Umbrians were brought in to complain about, but the most straightforward reading of the passage would indicate not the citizenship bill but the agrarian law to which Appian has referred directly above.

(207) This is the conclusion of E. BADIAN, *Foreign Clientelae* (Oxford, 1958), 217 ff. ; P. BRUNT, "Italian Aims at the Time of the Social War", *JRS*, 55 (1965), 90-109 (especially pp. 94-5) ; and HARRIS, *op. cit.*, 13. That they even desired the citizenship at all (in contrast to the other allies) has been denied by PIOTROWICZ, "Quelques remarques sur l'attitude de l'Étrurie pendant les troubles civils à la fin de la République romaine", *Klio*, 23 (1930), 334-338 ; followed by J. CARCOPINO, *Histoire Romaine*, II (Paris, 1954), 368 ; and E. GABBA, "Le origini della guerra sociale e la vita politica romana l'89 a.C.", *Athen*. n.s. 32 (1954), 41-114 and 293-345. The argument is that citizenship would have been viewed by the Etruscan *principes* as inimical to the rigid social dichotomy between *domini* and *serui* (= serfs) on which their society was based. But aside from the uncertainty that true serfdom still persisted in Etruria as late as this, Appian's plain statement that the Etruscans accepted the citizenship gladly when it was finally offered to them without strings attached in 90 B.C. cannot reasonably be contravened (cf. APPIAN, *BC*, 1.49).

(208) APP., *BC*, 1.7, 26-27. We know specifically of territory mulcted from Caere, Tarquinii, and Vulci where a number of Roman colonies were eventually planted.

The extent of the Gracchan commission's activity in Etruria is unknown, but Harris points out that the story of Ti. Gracchus' reaction to the desolation which he saw in coastal Etruria, a story which bears the marks of Caius' propaganda, would seem in-appropriate if in fact the Gracchi had done nothing, or intended nothing, in the region at all (209). We should conclude, then, that the Etruscan land-owning class during the generation between 133 and 91 B.C. viewed with continuing apprehension the likelihood that at any moment a significant portion of their holdings might be forfeit to agrarian legislation over which they, and the Optimate majority in the Roman senate, had no effective control.

Apprehension manifested itself once again in religious guise, mediated by the haruspices.

We note first that occasion on which the haruspices are seen to play a role in the senatorial counter-attatack against Caius Gracchus early in 121 B.C. in the familiar episode of the prodigies that were reported from Gracchus' new colony of Junonia. It had been announced by officials there that wolves had pulled up the boundary markers, that wind had carried away a *signifer's* standard, and that sacrificial victims lying on the altars had been scattered by a hurricane beyond the boundaries of the city. According to Appian, the haruspices declared that this was an ill omen for the colony and as a result the senate moved quickly to repeal its foundation (210). It is possible that the prodigies at Junonia were never officially accepted as *prodigia publica* ; we are not informed of any expiation (though our sources for this period frequently omit that information). In any case, simply the opinion of the haruspices was sufficient for the senate's and Opimius' purposes. Gracchus' colonial bill was not, in itself, of course, any threat to Etruscan *ager publicus*, but haruspices, and the interests they represented, might well seize on any opportunity which offered itself to thwart him.

(209) Plut., *Ti. Gracchus*, 8 ; Harris, *op. cit.*, 206.

(210) Plut., *C. Gracchus*, 11 ; Obs., 33 ; App., *BC*, 1.24. Appian, the only one of our three sources to note any priestly response to these prodigies, uses the ambiguous Greek word, *μάντεις* to designate the priesthood in question. In all Greek writers the term may be used indifferently for augurs or haruspices. (E.g., in Appian it designates augurs at BC, 1.78, haruspices at *BC*, 4.4). For the incident of 121 B.C., Rawson ("Religion and Politics in the Late Second Century at Rome", *Phoenix*, 28 [1974], 197) takes the term to mean augurs – surely incorrectly. Augurs did not offer interpretations of supernatural signs other than thunder and lightning occurring in the context of comitial proceedings or bird signs in connection with other magisterial acts (cf. Wissowa, *RE*, 2.2.2313-44, "Augures" (1895).

A second instance of haruspicial opposition to agrarian reform concerns the bill proposed by the tribune, Sex. Titius in 99 B.C. Obsequens (46) tells us that at the *contio* where Titius introduced the bill two crows were seen fighting in the air above. For this the haruspices prescribed a sacrifice to Apollo and postponement of decision on the bill.

Obsequens' entry is misleading to the extent that certainly it was not haruspices themselves but the augurs who formally postponed the *comitia* (this is confirmed by Cicero [*de Leg.* 31] who cites this very incident as an example of augural power, without making mention of haruspices at all). Nevertheless, it appears that haruspices played a part in declaring the assembly illomened through the occurrence of the prodigy whose expiation they then recommended. We know nothing of the content of Titius' bill except that, according to Valerius Maximus, it made him *gratiosus ad populum*, which might suggest that it aimed at providing land in Italy for Roman plebeians (211).

We call attention, finally, to one other piece of evidence, which, though unconnected with a prodigy so far as we know, adds further confirmation to our belief that haruspices employed the language of religion to convey the opposition of their class to agrarian reform. This, of course, is the famous prophecy of Vegoia (212). The many difficulties which that document presents, especially with regard to the question of Etruscan serfdom, need not concern us (213). Though its language may be anachronistic, no one doubts that it is fundamentally a protest against anyone's tampering with the sacred boundaries of land in Etruria, and that, whatever its antecedents may have been, the Latin version preserved to us circulated in Rome some time during the late second to early first century B.C., against the background of the events which we have just been considering (214).

(211) VAL. MAX., 8.1., *damn.*, 3. H. LAST (*CAH*, ix, 172) suggests that it was a revival of Saturninus' overseas colonial bill for Marian veterans.

(212) K. LACHMANN, ed., *Die Schriften der Römischen Feldmesser*, vol. i (Berlin, 1848), 348-50.

(213) The prophecy has generated a considerable literature ; among the principal discussions are : K. O. MÜLLER-W. DEECKE, *Die Etrusker*, ii^2 (Stuttgart, 1877), 30-31, 298-99, 312 ; THULIN, *op. cit.*, i, 3-8 ; PIOTROWICZ, *art. cit.*, 336 ; L. ZANCAN, *A. & R.*, ser. 3.7 (1939), 203-219 ; S. WEINSTOCK in *RE* s.v. "Vegoia" (1955) ; S. MAZZARINO in *Historia*, 7 (1957), 110 ff. ; J. HEURGON in *JRS*, 49 (1959), 41-45 ; HARRIS, *op. cit.*, 31-40, 202-3.

(214) The document may be dated approximately from the phrase *nouissimi octaui saeculi* (line 5) which is correctly interpreted by HEURGON (*art. cit.*, p. 42) as "almost in the last part of the eigth century" (The eighth saeculum ended in 88 B.C. on the evidence of

It is only necessary for our purpose to call attention to the strongly haruspicial tone of the document. The storms, whirlwinds, earthquakes, hail, blight, and civil dissensions which will result from moving the boundary stones (lines 12-15) have many echoes in the brontoscopic calendars as well as the harupicial *responsum* of 56 B.C. whose language Cicero preserves (215). *Agrimensura* was not wholly alien to the haruspices' professional concerns. The divine hero Tages, whose revelations were the source of Etruscan fulgural lore, was also, according to Servius Danielis (*ad Aen.* I 2) the reputed author of a book *qui inscribitur terrae iuris Etruriae*. Conversely, the Vegoia to whom the prophecy is attributed was also associated with lightning lore – the only context in which she was known to Ammianus (17.10,2).

We noted above that Vegoia was honored by the *decemuiri*, who preserved Books attributed to her in their collection of Sibylline oracles. The *Libri Vegoici* to which Servius and Ammianus refer, may have dealt only with lightning lore, and there is no indication that our prophecy formed a part of those Books. But even if it did not, the invocation of Vegoia by the haruspices in Rome in the later second or early first century becomes more intelligible if we see behind it the added authority of the *decemuiri* and, indeed, of a majority of the entire Roman religious establishment (216).

To say the Roman religious establishment is, however, simply to say the Roman establishment – primarily Optimate and certainly, on the whole, sympathetic to the anxieties of Etruscan oligarchs on the subject of agrarian reform. We are led from these observations, then, to propose an explanation for those peculiarities in the distribution of the activity of the

PLUT., *Sulla*, 7). It is rash to attempt more precision than this, as Heurgon does in arguing for precisely the year 91 B.C. Other dates, such as 133 or 99, seem equally possible. In any case, the document can hardly be pre-Gracchan.

(215) See A. PIGANIOL, "Sur le calendrier brontoscopique de Nigidius Figulus", in *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History Presented to Alan Chester Johnson* (1951), 78 ff. ; CIC., *Har. Resp.*, 40.

(216) We have already seen that haruspices and augurs combined in 99 B.C. to interrupt Titius' agrarian legislation, and L. Marcius Philippus, who, of the two consuls of 91, was primarily responsible for bringing in his Etruscan clients to oppose Drusus' bill, was himself an augur (and in that capacity apparently interfered with the *leges* Liviae ; cf. CIC., *Leg.*, 2.31) and a member of a decemviral family ; (two decemviral Marcii are known : the consul of 186 (LIVY, 40.42, 11-12 and 41.21, 10-11] and the consul of 39 B.C. [*Augustan Saecular Acta*, 1.44]).

haruspices and in the incidence of prodigies from federate Etruscan cities to which we have already called attention [217].

From the end of the Second Punic War to the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus the haruspices appear in our records with some frequency [218]. Their appearances during these relatively untroubled decades are certainly unconnected with any external threat to Etruria and, so far as appears, unconnected too with any instance of internal unrest [219]. The exigencies of the Hannibalic war had established the haruspices firmly in Rome as a reliable body of religious experts to be called upon from time to time in the event of prodigies which fell within their special province. But from the 130's B.C. we begin to notice a significant rise in their activity, an increase in the types of prodigies which were their specialty, and, most significant, from 108 B.C. on, a heavy clustering of prodigies from certain Etruscan cities, most of which had apparently never reported previously.

We have found no evidence that these data are simply the product of source distortion, nor does any general trend toward occultism in the later Republic seem adequate as a total explanation – certainly not for the increased reporting from the Etruscan cities. I suggest, rather, that the prominence accorded by the Senate to haruspices and to prodigies for which they are the obvious channel of transmission during the decades from Gracchus to the Social War was, in large part at least, politically conditioned ; an acknowledgement on the part of senatorial Optimates of the anxieties of fellow oligarchs in Etruria. The landowning classes of other regions of Italy were, of course, just as apprehensive as Etruscan landowners were ; perhaps, in fact, more so. But, as the result of an historical process beginning in 278 B.C., it so happened that Etruria, through the special position accorded to haruspices, enjoyed an avenue of access to the Senate which no other Italian people possessed. And, throughout this period, haruspices continue to represent to a sympathetic Senate the fears of their compatriots in the familiar language of the prodigies [220].

(217) Above, p. 15 ff.

(218) Altogether in probably fourteen years, as opposed to twenty-two years for the decemviri during the same period ; see Appendix A.

(219) Such as the rebellion of *serui* in 196 B.C. which was swiftly put down, or an apparent disturbance of unknown nature in the years 190-89 B.C. which required the despatch of Roman troops (Livy, 33.36, 1-2 ; 37.2, 1 ; 2, 9 ; 50, 13 ; 57, 3).

(220) The generally conservative political bias of the haruspices has been recognized by Thulin, *op. cit.*, i, 70-71, iii, 135 ; Bloch, *op. cit.*, 52 ; Pfiffig, *op. cit.*, 45 (though this view

It may be a measure of the strength of the "entente" which existed between the Roman and Etruscan oligarchies, enhanced by the role of the haruspices at Rome, that when the Social War came, the Etruscan cities held back from hostilities for so long and stopped fighting so soon.

is now somewhat modified by Rawson in *JRS*, 68 (1978), 132-151). For the use of religion by the Optimates in the political struggles of the later second century, see Rawson in *Phoenix*, 28 (1974), 193-212.

CONCLUSION

It has been the aim of this study to argue that the political possibilities of the spontaneous phenomenon of prodigy sighting did not go unappreciated by the Romans. The political uses of prodigies and oracles in domestic politics have been studied elsewhere (221). Equally important, though less apparent, was their function as a vehicle for communication of politically charged messages between Rome and the Italian allies, tending to weld the confederation together into a psychological unity.

As ever in studies of Roman religion, our data are less full and less clear than we would like them to be, and it would be rash to claim certainty for our conclusions. The virtue that we claim for the interpretation offered is, first that it appears to account well for several different sets of empirical data – the prodigy locales of peregrine status, the specific content of some well reported expiations, the role of the haruspices ; secondly that it places the Roman prodigy in a reasonably well established context of the political and imperialist uses of Roman religion generally. By so doing, it encourages us to believe that the data that we have, though far from complete, are, on the whole, reliable and preserve a fair reflection of reality.

We terminate our study with the outbreak of the Social War because that event, in fact, seems to mark the end of a definite era in the history of the Roman prodigy. *Prodigia publica* are reported to us in large numbers from every year of the decade 99 to 90 B.C., but from only four years in the 80's, still less frequently in the 70's and 60's, and only slightly more frequently in the 50's and 40's. Thereafter, reports are very rare (222). Livy comments in a famous passage on the neglect of prodigies in his own day, *quia nihil deos portendere uulgo nunc credant, neque nuntiari admodum*

(221) E.g., L. R. Taylor, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* (Berkeley, 1949), Ch. 4 ; J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford, 1979), Ch. 1, *passim*.

(222) See Appendix A, p. 99 ff.

ulla prodigia in publicum neque in annales referri (43.13,1). Increasingly the public prodigy gives way to the private omen relating to the personal fortunes of the great military figures of the late Republic and to the emperors after them (223). Further, the great majority of these late prodigies are reported only from Rome itself – far fewer, proportionally as well as absolutely, of the Italian cities are represented in our post-Social War lists than in those of the earlier period. For example, the barrage of prodigy reports from the Etruscan cities which appears to begin suddenly in 108 B.C. comes to an abrupt end in 91, and thereafter we find only one report from Clusium in 83 and one from "Etruria" in 69 A.D. (224).

The reasons for the decline in importance of the *prodigia publica* from the early first century B.C. on are likely to be as complex as the causes which first gave rise to the Romans' extraordinary preoccupation with them in the earliest period of Roman history. One should hesitate to offer an all-embracing explanation of either phenomenon. The Roman prodigy in its hey-day undoubtedly answered to a variety of collective psychological, social, and political needs. But one of those needs, at any rate – that to which this study has been devoted – ceased to exist at the conclusion of the Social War, when the unity of Italy could now be expressed concretely in terms of universal Roman citizenship, and the important divisions which remained were increasingly those of allegiance to class, party, and individual rather than to *respublica* and region. Without wishing to exaggerate the importance of this one function of the prodigy which we have singled out for study, we suggest that its disappearance was perhaps not an unimportant factor in the constellation of changes which brought about the decline (regretted by Livy) in the ability of the public prodigies to continue to provide an important collective experience.

(223) See, for example the last twenty chapters of Obsequens' *Liber Prodigiorum* covering the years 86 to 11 B.C., and the various Lives of Suetonius. Cf. also, Bloch, *op. cit.*, 142 ff.

(224) Obs., 57 ; Tac., *Hist.*, 1.86.

APPENDIX A : INDEX OF PRODIGIES

The following table lists every year for which *prodigia publica* are listed in our sources. In general, I have followed, Wülker's discriminations (*op. cit.*, pp. 86 ff.) among prodigies which are certainly or probably public and those which are certainly private (which occur, for the most part, in the later chapters of Obsequens' *Liber prodigiorum*). I have, however, included apocryphal prodigies and some private prodigies (enclosed in parentheses) which are of interest in any respect. The presence of the three priesthoods or of the Senate is indicated with an "(X)" whenever they are not named but their presence is certain beyond any doubt, as in the case of *decemuiri* and haruspices for androgyne expiations (cf. Livy, 27.37, 4-15) and pontiffs and the senate for the spears of Mars moving in the Regia (cf. Gellius *NA* 4.6, 1-2). I have not indicated the senate for every instance of a *nouemdiale sacrum* for a rain of stones although in most cases it should probably be understood. Likewise, I have not indicated the *decemuiri* for every unassigned *supplicatio* or *obsecratio* although statistically they are most likely to have recommended it. I have used a "?" sparingly to indicate my belief that an un-named priesthood should probably be understood. A very abbreviated indication of the prodigy and expiation is given, followed by full references.

Date	*Xuiri* [225]	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
Tullus Hostilius		X				rain of stones – *nouemdiale sacrum*. Livy 1.31.

(225) I designate the college as *Xuiri* throughout the table. In the early period (until 368 B.C.) its proper title was *IIuiri* and in the later Republic and Empire (from at least 51 B.C.) *XVuiri*.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
Undated-regal ?		X				girl with teeth – *Suessa Pometia*. Pliny, *NH* 7.68-69.
Tarquinius Superbus					*Libri Fatales*	miscarriages or pestilence – *Ludi Taurei*. Serv., *ad Aen*. 2.140.
Tarquinius Superbus		Olenus Calenus			*uates*, *manteis*	Capitoline head. Livy 1.55, 5-6 ; D.H. 4.59-61 ; Pliny, *NH* 28.13 ; Serv., *ad Aen*. 8.345 ; Arnob. 6, 7.
504 B.C.	X					miscarriages – games to Pluto and Apollo. Plut., *Public*. 21, 1.
496 B.C.	X					famine – *Cerialia* D.H. 6.17, 2-3 ; Pliny, *NH* 35, 154
490 B.C.					no exp. [226]	Strange sights, voices, *monstra*, etc. D.H. 7, 68.
483 B.C.			X		*Vates*, *manteis*	*incestum* of Vestals. Livy 2.42, 10 ; D.H. 8.89, 3-5.
472 B.C.			X		*manteis*	*incestum* of Vestals, Pestilence. D.H. 9.40, 1-4.

(226) Here and elsewhere the abbreviation "no exp." means that no reference is made to an expiation at all.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
464 B.C.					unspecified	blazing sky – feriae. Livy 3.5, 14.
463 B.C.				X		pestilence – first *supplicatio* Livy 3.7, 6-8 ; Oros. 2.12, 2 ; D.H. 9, 67.
461 B.C.	X				*manteis*	rain of meat, etc. – prophecy. Livy 3.10, 5-7 ; D.H. 10, 2, 2-6 ; Pliny, *NH* 2, 147 ; Val. Max. 1, 6, 5 ; Lydus, *de ost*. ch. 6, p. 13, II.3-5 W.
458 B.C.					unspecified	wolves in city – *lustratio*. Livy 3.29, 9.
436 B.C.	X					earthquake, (pestilence ?) – *obsecratio*. Livy 4.21, 5 ; Oros. 2.13, 8.
433 B.C.	X					pestilence – temple of Apollo. Livy 4.25, 3
403 B.C. or 400 B.C.					no exp. [226]	solar eclipse. Cic., *de Rep*. 1.25
399 B.C.	X					pestilence – first *lectisternium*. Livy 5.13, 4-8 ; D.H. 12, frg. 9 ; Aug., *CD* 3.17.
398 B.C.		Old Man of Veii				Alban Lake – prophecy. Livy 5.15 ; D.H. 12, 11-14 ; Plut., *Cam*. 4 ; Cic., *Diu*. 1.100 ; 2.69.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
(392 B.C.)					no exp. [226]	famine and pestilence – perhaps not a prodigy. Livy 5.31, 5 ; D.H. 13, frg. 4.
(390 B.C.)	X					advice on purifying temples. Livy 5.10, 1-2.
(389 B.C.)		L. Aquinius	X			*dies atri* – not a prodigy. Macrob., *Sat.* 1.16, 22-24.
364 B.C.			X			pestilence – third *lectisternium*, *ludi scaenici*. Livy 7.2, 1-7 ; Aug., *CD* 2.8 ; Oros. 3.4, 1-6.
362 B.C.	X	X			*Vates*	*Lacus Curtius* – *deuotio*. Livy 7.6, 1-6 ; Varro, *LL* 5.148 ; D.H. 14, frg. 11 ; Suidas 2.1, p. 573 G.
348 B.C.	X					Pestilence – fourth *lectisternium*, (*Ludi Tarentini* ?). Livy 7.27, 1.
344 B.C.	X					rain of stones and eclipse – *supplicatio*. Livy 7.28, 6-8.
(340 B.C.)		X				interpretation of dreams – *deuotio* of Decius. Livy 8.6, 9-12 ; 8.9, 1.
326 B.C.					unspecified	(pestilence ?) – fifth *lectisternium*. Livy 8.25, 1.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
296 B.C.		Manius		X	*manteis*	various prodigies – prophecy, *supplicationes*. Dio 8 (Zon. 8.1, 3); Livy 10.23, 1.
295 B.C.	X					first lightning prodigy. Livy 10.31, 8.
293 B.C.	X					pestilence – Aesculapius. Livy 10.47, 6 ; *Per.* 11 ; Plut., *QR* 94 ; Val. Max. 1.8, 2 ; Aug., *CD* 3, 17 ; Oros. 3.22, 5 ; *de Vir. Illus.* 22, 1 ; Ovid, *Metam.* 15, 622 ff.
278 B.C.		X				lightning strikes – Summanus. Cic., *Diu.* 1.16 ; Livy, per. 14.
Undated (ca. 278-250 ?)		X				lightning strikes – statue of Horatius. Gell., *NA* 4.5, 1.
269 B.C.		?			no exp. [226]	various prodigies incl. first from a peregrine town (Cales). Oros. 4.4, 1-4.
267 B.C.					no exp. [226]	two prodigies. Oros 4.5, 1.
266 B.C. ?	X					pestilence – restoration of shrines. Aug., *CD* 3, 17 ; Oros. 4.5, 7 ; cf. 4.5, 9.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
249 B.C.	X					lightning, war, disease – *Ludi Saeculares*. Livy, per. 49 ; Cens., *DN* 17, 8 ; Fest. 441.4 ; Schol. ad Hor., *CS* 8.
(238 B.C.)	X					(dearth ?) – *Floralia*. Pliny, *NH* 18, 286.
292-219 B.C.	X					(prodigies unspecified *impudicitia ?*) – *Venus Verticordia*. Val. Max. 8.15, 12 ; Pliny, *NH*. 7.120.
(236 B.C.)	X					*instauratio* of *Ludi Saeculares*. *Fast. Cap.*, frg. 49 ; Degrassi 62 ff., 142 ; Aug., *CD* 3.18 ; Cens., *DN* 17.
228 B.C.	X					lightning strikes temple of Apollo – sibylline oracle. Dio 12, frg. 50.
225 B.C.	X	?				first human sacrifice. Plut., *Marc.* 3 ; Dio 12 (Zon. 8, 19) ; Oros. 4.13, 3 ; cf. Pliny, *NH* 28, 12 ; 30.3, 12 ; Livy 22.57 ; 6.
223 B.C.					no exp. [226]	five prodigies. Dio 12 (Zon. 8.20, 4) ; Oros. 4.13, 12 ; Plut., *Marc.* 4. ; Pliny, *NH* 2.99.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
218 B.C.	X					twelve prodigies – numerous expiations. Livy 21.62 ; Val. Max. 1.6, 5 ; Dio 13 (Zon. 8.22, 5).
217 B.C. (a)	X			X		twenty prodigies – numerous expiations, incl. *Saturnalia*. Livy 22.1, 8-20 ; Plut., *Fab.* 2 ; Macrob., *Sat.* 1.6, 13-14 (?) ; Oros. 4.15, 1 ; Val. Max. 1.6, 5.
217 B.C. (b)					no exp. [226]	numerous earthquakes. Pliny, *NH* 2.200 ; Cic., *Diu.* 1.78.
217 B.C. (c)	X		X			Flaminius' "sacriledge" – several exp's. incl. *uer sacrum*. Livy 22.9-10 ; cf. 33.44, 1 ; Plut., *Fab.* 3.
216 B.C. (a)	X					five prodigies – no details of exp. Livy 22.36, 6-9 ; cf. Dio 15 (Zon. 9.1).
216 B.C. (b)	X	?	X			*incestum* of Vestals, human sacrifice, mission to Delphi. Livy 22.57, 2-6 ; cf. 23.11, 1-6 ; Livy, per. 22 ; Plut., *Fab.* 18.
215 B.C.					unspecified	four prodigies. Livy 23.31, 15 ; Dio 15 (Zon. 9.3, 3).

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
214 B.C.	?	X				eighteen prodigies – sacrifice. Livy 24.10, 6-13.
213 B.C.			X			five prodigies – no details of exp. Livy 24.44, 7-9.
212 B.C. (a)					unspecified	six prodigies – *supplicatio*. Livy 25.7, 7-9.
212 B.C. (b)	X					*Carmina Marciana* – *Ludi Apollinares* Livy 25.12 ; Macrob., *Sat.* 1.17, 25-30 ; Cic., *Diu.* 1.89 ; 115 ; Serv., *ad Aen.* 6.70, 72 ; Dio 15 (Zon. 9.1).
211 B.C.					unspecified	six prodigies – standard expiations. Livy 26.23, 4-6.
210 B.C.			X			seven prodigies – *supplicatio* at Capena. Livy 27.4, 11-15.
209 B.C.					unspecified	ten prodigies incl. Alban Mt. and Lake, first androgyne – sacrifice, *supplicatio*. Livy 27.11, 1-6.
208 B.C. (a)		?			unspecified	six prodigies, bees – *supplicatio*. Livy 27.23, 1-4.
208 B.C. (b)	?	?			unspecified	pestilence and bees – *Ludi Apollinares* fixed. Livy 27.23, 5-7.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
207 B.C.	X	X	X			eight prodigies plus androgyne and lightning striking temple of Juno Regina – first full andro. expiation. Livy 27.37, 4-15.
206 B.C.		?	X	X		twelve prodigies and extinction of Fire ; *monstrum* and bees (?). Livy 28.11, 1-7 ; Dio 17.60.
205 B.C.	X				*manteis*	frequent rains of stones – *Magna Mater*. Livy 29.10, 4-5 ; 14, 5-14 ; Suet., *Tib.* 2.3 ; Ovid, *Fast.* 4.395 ff. ; Pliny, *NH* 7.120 ; Lact., *Inst. Diu.* 2.7 ; App., *Hann.* 56.
204 B.C.					unspecified	seven prodigies – standard expiations. Livy 29.14, 2-5.
203 B.C.			X			eight prodigies – sacrifice. Livy 30.2, 9-13.
202 B.C.					unpecified	six prodigies – standard expiations. Livy 30.38, 8-10.
201 B.C.					no exp.	grain grew on trees. Pliny, *NH* 18, 166.
200 B.C.	X	(X)				eight prodigies incl. two androgynes exp. for andro. Livy 31.12, 5-10.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
199 B.C.		X		X		eight prodigies incl. laurel on a ship – sacrifice, *supplicatio*. Livy 32.1, 10-14.
198 B.C.					unspecified	eight prodigies – *supplicatio*. Livy 32.9, 1-4.
197 B.C.					unspecified	six prodigies – no details of expiation. Livy 32.29, 1-2.
196 B.C.					unspecified	four prodigies sacrifice. Livy 33.26, 6-9.
194 B.C.			X			seven prodigies – *nouemdiale sacrum*. Livy 34.45, 6-8.
193 B.C. (a)	X					frequent earthquakes – *supplicationes*. Livy 34.55, 1-5.
193 B.C. (b)	X					seven prodigies – standard expiations. Livy 35.9, 3-5.
192 B.C.		X				consul's cow spoke and four other prodigies – cow nurtured. Livy 35.21, 2-5.
191 B.C.	X	X				oxen climb stairs – ordered burned alive ; four other prodigies – *ieiunium Cereri* and other expiations. Livy 36.37, 2-6

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
190 B.C.	X		X			six prodigies – *supplicatio* with ten boys and girls. Livy 37.3, 1-6 ; Obs. 1.
188 B.C.	X					eclipse, rain of stones – standard expiations. Livy 38.36, 4 ; Obs. 2.
187 B.C.	X					pestilence – *supplicatio*. Livy 38.44, 7.
186 B.C.	(X)	X	X			four prodigies incl. androgyne – various expiations. Livy 39.22, 2-5 ; Obs. 3.
183 B.C.	X					rain of blood in area Volcani (et Concordiae) ; emergence of island near Sicily – *supplicationes*. Livy 39.46, 5 ; 56, 6 ; Obs. 4 ; Oros. 4.20, 30 ; cf. Verg., *Aen*. 8.422.
182 B.C.		X				destructive storm, two other prodigies – sacrifice, *supplicatio*. Livy 40.2, 1-4 ; Obs. 5.
181 B.C.	X		(X)	X		spears of Mars move, pestilence and two other prodigies – *supplicatio per totam Italian*. Livy 40.19, 1-5 ; Obs. 6.
180 B.C.	X		X			pestilence – *supplicatio* vows. Livy 40.37, 1-3.
179 B.C. (a)	X					four prodigies – standard expiations. Livy 40.44, 3-5 ; Obs. 7.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
179 B.C. (b)					unspecified	disturbance at *lectisternium* – *instauratio* of Ludi Romani. Livy 40.59, 6-8 ; Obs. 7.
178 B.C.					no exp. [226]	temple of Venus burns, fire of Vesta goes out. Livy, per. 41 ; Obs. 8.
177 B.C. (a)					unspecified	six prodigies – standard expiations. Livy 41.9, 4-8.
177 B.C. (b)		X				talking cow and two other prodigies – *supplicatio*, cow nurtured. Livy 41.13, 1-3.
176 B.C.			X			five prodigies – incl. mysterious death of a pontiff. – no details of expiation. Livy 41.16, 6 ; Obs. 9.
174 B.C. (a)	X					ten prodigies – incl. pestilence – *supplicatio*, vow. Livy 41.21, 10-13 ; Obs. 10 ; Pliny, *NH*. 2.99.
174 B.C. (b)					unspecified	earthquake *supplicatio* to Ceres. Livy 41.28, 2.
173 B.C.	X					five prodigies – standard expiations. Livy 42.2, 3-7.
172 B.C.	X	X				lightning strikes columna rostrata ; Xviri and har.'s both respond ; four other prodigies – *supplicatio* and *feriae*. Livy 42.20, 1-6.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
171 B.C.		X				sex-change – child deported to island. Pliny, *NH* 7, 36.
169 B.C. (a)	X					eight prodigies plus two "non suscepta" (Fregellae and Marcius Figulus) – sacrifice and *supplicatio*. Livy 43.13, 3-8.
169 B.C. (b)					unspecified	two rains of stones – *nouemdiale sacrum*. Livy 44.18, 6-7.
167 B.C.	X					five prodigies – *supplicationes*, sacrifice, *lustratio*. Livy 45.16, 5-6 ; Obs. 11.
166 B.C.					unspecified	eleven prodigies – lustration. Obs. 12.
165 B.C.	X					three prodigies – public prayers, lustration. Obs. 13.
163 B.C. (a)					no exp. [226]	eighteen prodigies. Obs. 14.
(163 B.C.) (b)		X				Gracchus denounces haruspices' charge of faulty election. Cic., *Nat. Deor.* 2.4, 10-11.
162 B.C.					no exp. [226]	four prodigies. Obs. 15.
156 B.C.					no exp. [226]	four prodigies. Obs. 16.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
154 B.C.					no exp.	three prodigies. Obs. 17 ; Pliny, *NH* 17, 244.
152 B.C.		X				wind blows over statue – har.'s force all magistrates to abdicate ; two other prodigies *supplicatio*. Obs. 18.
147 B.C.					no exp. [226]	five prodigies. Obs. 20.
(143 B.C.) (a)	X					Claudius defeated by the Salassi – two *Xuiri* sacrifice on the borders of Gaul. Dio 22, frg. 74 ; Obs. 21 ; cf. Oros. 5.4, 7.
(143 B.C.) (b)	X					Sibylline opposition to Aqua Marcia, other prodigies as well (?) – no details of exp. Fron., *de Aqua*. 7 ; Livy, ep. Oxy. 54.
142 B.C.	X	X				pestilence, androgyne – *supplicatio*, andro. exp. Obs. 22 ; Oros. 5.4, 8.
140 B.C.					unspecified	two prodigies – sacrifice. Obs. 23.
137 B.C.		X				seven prodigies – exp. is unclear. Obs. 24 ; Oros. 4.5, 19 ; Livy, per. 55.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
136 B.C.		X				four prodigies – incl. monstrous child – cremated. Obs. 25.
135 B.C.		?			unspecified	five prodigies – incl. owl seen on the Capitol – cremated. Obs. 26 ; Oros. 5.6, 1-2.
134 B.C.		?			unspecified	six prodigies – incl. talking ox – publicly nurtured. Obs. 27.
133 B.C.	X	(X)				nine prodigies – incl. androgyne – andro expiation, decemviral sacrifice to Ceres at Enna. Obs. 27a ; Cic., *Verr.* 2.4.108 ; Val. Max. 1.1, 1 ; Lact., *Inst. Diu.* 2.4, 29 ; Diod., 34/35, frg. 10.
130 B.C.		X				eight prodigies – incl. Apollo at Cumae weeping – haruspicial prophecy and conflict with Elders of Cumae. Obs. 28 ; Aug., *CD* 3.11 ; Dio 24, frg. 84.2.
129 B.C.		?			unspecified	three prodigies – prophecy of civil war. Cic., *Nat. Deor.* 2.14-15 ; *ad Quint. fratr.* 3.5, 1 ; Obs. 28a.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
126 B.C.		X		X ?		explosion of Aetna and pestilence in Liparis – prophecy (and senatorial deputation ?). Obs. 29 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.203 ; Oros. 5.10, 11 ; Strabo 6.2, 11.
125 B.C.	X	(X)				five prodigies plus an androgyne – androgyne expiation. Obs. 30 ; cf. Livy, per. 60 ; Oros. 5.11 ; Aug., *CD* 3.31 ; Phlegon, *Mirab*. 10, F. Gr. Hist. 2.257. 36 (X).
124 B.C.					no exp. [226]	three prodigies. Obs. 31.
122 B.C.	(X)	(X)				five prodigies – incl. an androgyne. Obs. 32.
(121 B.C.)		X				prodigies at Junonia (probably not public). Plut., *C. Gracchus* 11 ; App. *BC* 1.24 ; Obs. 33 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.98.
119 B.C.	(X)	(X)				androgyne. Obs. 34.
118 B.C.	X	?				five prodigies – incl. bees. Obs. 35 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.99.
117 B.C.	X	X	(X)	(X)		five prodigies – incl. androgyne and spears of Mars moving. Obs. 36 ; Cic., *Diu*. 1.97.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
115 B.C.		(X)				temple of Juno struck by lightning. Pliny, *NH* 2.144.
114 B.C.	X	X	(X)			Helvia struck by lightning – execution of Vestals, human sacrifice. Obs. 37 ; Livy, per. 63 ; Oros. 5.15, 20-22 ; Dio 26, frg. 87 ; Plut., *QR* 83 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.98 and 147.
113 B.C.					no exp. [226]	five prodigies. Obs. 38 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.100.
111 B.C.					unspecified	two prodigies – sacrifice. Obs. 39.
108 B.C.	X					five prodigies – incl. auis incendiaria and cannibalism – decemviral sacrifice at Cimolia. Obs. 40.
106 B.C.					no exp. [226]	ten prodigies; Obs. 40.
105 B.C.					unspecified	three prodigies – lustration of Capitol, hymn to the gods by matrons. Obs. 42 ; Gran. Licin., p. 12-13.
104/3 B.C.	(X?)	X				eighteen prodigies, plus very likely an androgyne – haruspicial responsum and what appears to be an andro. expiation. Obs. 43 ; Pliny, *NH* 16.132, and 2.148 ; Plut., *Mar.* 17, 4.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
102 B.C.	X	X	(X)	(X)		ten prodigies – joint lustration of city by *Xuiri* and har.'s ; Aemilius Potensis rewarded. Obs. 44.
101 B.C.					unspecified	two or three prodigies – lustration of city. Obs. 44a ; Livy, per. 68.
100 B.C.	X					three to five prodigies – no expiations ; foundation of Eporedia by Sibylline oracle. Obs. 45 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.100 ; 3.123 ; Vell. 1.15.
99 B.C. (a)	(X?)	X				six or seven prodigies – incl. probably an androgyne-type exp., opposition to Sex. Titius. Obs. 46.
99 B.C. (b)			X	X		spears of Mars move in Regia – reported by pontiffs, expiated by order of Senate. Gell., *NA* 4.6, 1-2.
98 B.C.	X	(X)	(X)	(X)		seven prodigies, incl. an androgyne and spears of Mars moving. Obs. 47.
97 B.C.	(X)	(X)				three prodigies – incl. an androgyne – andro. exp. Obs. 48.
96 B.C.					unspecified	six prodigies – lustration of city. Obs. 49.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
95 B.C.	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)		ten prodigies – incl. androgyne and spears of Mars. Obs. 50.
94 B.C.					unspecified	nine prodigies – incl. rain of stones – *nouem. sacrum*. Obs. 51.
93 B.C.					unspecified	fourteen prodigies – *nouem. sacrum*, lustration. Obs. 52.
92 B.C.	(X)	(X)				twelve prodigies – incl. an androgyne. Obs. 53.
91 B.C.	?	X				nine prodigies – incl. eathquake at Mutina, T. of Pietas ?). Obs. 54 ; Oros. 5.18, 3-6 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.199.
ca. 90 B.C. (a)		X				five prodigies – haruspicial interpretation. Cic., *Diu*. 1.99 ; Pliny, *NH* 8.221.
ca. 90 B.C. (b)	?	X				sex change – monstrum burned alive. Diod. 32.12, 2.
ca. 90-88 B.C. (c)				X		seismic disturbance in Liparis – senatorial deputation. Pliny, *NH* 2.238 ; cf. *NH* 2.203, Strabo 6.2.11.
(90 B.C.) (d)		X				flames from the earth – haruspicial prophecy to Sulla (probably not public). Plut., *Sulla*, 6.6 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.98.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
88 B.C.		X				six prodigies – incl. trumpet blast from sky – haruspices prophesy end of saeculum. Plut., *Sulla* 7.2-6 ; Diod. 38, frg. 5.
87 B.C.	X					some private (?) prodigies – publications of Sibylline oracle about Cinna. Gran. Licin., p. 23 ; cf. Obs. 56a ; Livy, per. 79 ; Cic., *Nat. Deor.* 2.14 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.92.
(86 B.C.)		X				soldier in Sulla's army struck by lightning haruspicial prophecy. Obs. 56b.
84 B.C.		X				lightning strikes temples of Luna and Ceres – comitia postponed. App., *BC* I.78.
83 B.C.		X				four or five prodigies – incl. woman bearing a snake – thrown into river. Obs. 57 ; App., *BC* 1.83 ; Pliny, *NH* 7.34.
78 B.C.					no exp. [226]	talking chicken. Pliny, *NH* 10.50.
76 B.C.					no exp. [226]	earthquake and fremitus Obs. 59 ; PLiny, *NH* 2.100.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
65 B.C.		X				lightning strikes Capitol – haruspices predict civil discord. Cic., *Cat.* 3.19-20 ; *Diu.* 1.19-20 ; Obs. 61 ; Dio 37. 9.2 ; 37.34, 3-4 ; Arnob. 7.38.
63 B.C.					no exp. [226]	six prodigies. Cic., *Cat.* 3.18 ; Obs. 61 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.137 ; Dio, 37.25, 1-2.
60 B.C.					no exp. [226]	four prodigies. Obs. 62.
56 B.C. (a)	X					lightning strikes – Jupiter on Alban Mt.-Sibylline oracle about Ptolemy. Dio 39.15-16.
56 B.C. (b)		X				strepitus in ager Latiniensis and other prodigies – haruspicial responsum. Cic., *Har. Resp.* passim ; Dio 39.20, 2.
ca. 56-52 B.C.		X				infant speaks haruspices predict destruction. Phlegon, *Olym.*, frg. 13.
54 B.C. (a)	X					Tiber flood – publication of Sibylline oracle concerning Gabinius. Dio 39.60, 4-61, 4.
54 B.C. (b)		X				rain of iron in Lucania – haruspicial interpretation. Pliny, *NH* 2.147 ; Lydus, *de Ost.* c, p. 13, 1 W.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
53 B.C.					unspecified	four prodigies – lustration of city. Obs. 63 ; Dio 40.17, 1.
52 B.C.					no exp. [226]	five prodigies. Dio 40, 47, 1-2.
50 B.C.		?			unspecified ified	three prodigies – haruspicial type prediction of civil discord. Obs. 65 ; Pliny 2.147.
ca. 50 B.C.	X					sinking tree – Sibylline Books predict death of men. Pliny, *NH* 7.243.
48 B.C.		X				bees on the Capitol – haruspicial order to destroy the precincts of Isis and Serapis. Dio 42.26, 1-2 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.92.
47 B.C.		X				five prodigies – incl. monstrous births – haruspicial interpretation. Dio 42.26, 3-5.
46 B.C.					no exp. [226]	two prodigies. Dio 43.2, 1.
44 B.C.					unspecified	seventeen prodigies – sacrifice of a bull in temple of Vesta. Obs. 68 ; Dio 45.17, 2-8 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.96, 98-99 ; Oros. 6.20, 5 ; Lydus, *de Ost.* c. 10b, p. 34, 15 , Obs. 67 ; Suet., *D. Julius*, 81.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
43 B.C.		X				nine prodigies – oldest haruspex predicts return of kingship and commits suicide. App., *BC* 4, 4 ; Obs. 69 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.92.
42 B.C.		(X)				fourteen prodigies – plus three not public in Casius' camp (haruspices). Obs. 70 ; Dio 47.40, 2-8 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.99.
38 B.C.	X					three prodigies – statue of Virtus purified. Dio 48.43, 4-6.
37 B.C.			X			Statue of Avernus sweats – piacularia ordered. Dio 48.50, 4 ; Serv. *ad Georg.*, 2.162.
17 B.C.					no exp. [226]	three prodigies – (Augustan Saecular games). Obs. 71.
16 B.C.					unspecified	four prodigies – prayers offered for Augustus' safety. Dio 54.19, 7.
43 A.D.					unspecified	owl enters Capitoline temple – city lustrated. Pliny, *NH* 10.35.
ca. 45 A.D.					unspecified	sex change at Antioch – altar to "Zeus Alexikakos" of the Capitol. Phlegon, *Mirab.* frg. 36 (VI).

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
51 A.D.			(X)			four prodigies – Claudius, as Pont. Max., orders expiations. Tac., *Ann.* 12.43 ; Suet., *Claud.* 22 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.99.
54 A.D.		?			no exp. [226]	five prodigies – incl. bees and monstrum. Tac., *Ann.* 12.64, 1-3.
55 A.D.		X				temples struck by lightning – city lustrated. Tac., *Ann.* 13.24.
64 A.D.	X					great fire – supplications to Vulcan, Ceres, Prosperina and Juno. Tac., *Ann.* 15.44, 1-2.
64 A.D. (b)		X				four prodigies – *monstra* – haruspicial interpretation. Tac., *Ann.* 15.47.
69 A.D.					no exp. [226]	five or more prodigies. Tac., *Hist.* 1.86 ; Plut., *Otho*, 4 ; Suet., *Vesp.* 5.
112 A.D.		X				monstrous birth – thrown into Tiber. Phlegon, *Mirab.*, frg. 36 (XXV).
241 A.D.	X					great earthquakes – sacrifices. SHA, *Gord.*, 26.2.
262 A.D.	X					four prodigies – incl. pestilence – sacrifice to Juppiter Salus. SHA, *Gall.* 5, 2-5.

Date	*Xuiri*	Har.	Pont.	Sen.	Uncertain	Prodigy & Expiation
(363 A.D.)		X				soldier struck by lightning – haruspicial interpretation. Amm. Marc. 23.5, 12-13.

Summary of chronological distribution :

Prodigy reports are very sparse before 218 B.C. They become regular and frequent in 218 (concurrent with the resumption of Livy's narrative and the beginning of the Second Punic war) and continue frequent through the 160's. There is a sharp drop in the 150's and 140's to less than half as many reporting years as in the immediately preceding decades, followed by a rise in the 130's through the 90's. The decade of the 90's is the first since the Second Punic War to have an entry, or multiple entries, for every year. After this, the number of reporting years declines sharply in the 80's, 70's, and 60's. There is a rise in the 50's and 40's, though not equalling the hight point of the 90's. Reports are very sparse thereafter, dwindling to a frequency comparable to the period before 218 B.C.

Decemuiri appear relatively more active than haruspices down through the 140's ; (the one exception to this, the 150's, is too sparsely covered to provide real information). Beginning in the 130's this relative frequency reverses for the first time, and down through the 40's (the last decade for which there is fairly consistent reporting) haruspices appear more active than *decemuiri* in every decade except possible 109-110 B.C. The preponderance of haruspices over *decemuiri* appears greatest in the decade of the 90's (which also contains the largest absolute number of prodiges assignable to haruspices in any decade). After the 90's, haruspices are still apparently more active than *decemuiri* but absolute numbers for both groups are smaller and the differential is sometimes slight.

Admittedly, in all periods, numbers of prodiges whose expiations can be firmly attributed to one priesthood or another are small, and the relative frequencies could perhaps be upset by a small amount of additional information – which, is unlikely to ever be forthcoming.

APPENDIX B : DISTRIBUTION OF PRODIGIES BY JURIDICAL STATUS

I. Latin Colonies.

1. Alba Fucens (Sabini).
   206 B.C. (Livy 28.11, 3).
   (137 B.C. [Obs. 24] – Fucine Lake ; possibly reported from Marsic territory).

2. Ardea (Latium).
   198 B.C. (Livy 32.9,2).
   133 B.C. (Obs. 27 ; Cic., *Verr*. iv 108).

3. Ariminum (Ager Gallicus).
   223 B.C. (Oros. 4.13,12 et al.).
   194 B.C. (Livy 24.45,7).
   104 B.C. (Obs. 43).

4. Bononia (Cispadana).
   135 B.C. (Obs. 26 ; Oros. 5.6,2).

5. Cales (Campania).
   269 B.C. (Oros. 4.4).
   214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,7).

6. Carseoli (Latium).
   93 B.C. (Obs. 52).

7. Fregellae (Latium).
   211 B.C. (Livy 26.23,5).
   206 B.C. (Livy 28.11,1f.).
   (169 B.C. [Livy 43.13,3-8] – *non susceptum* ; see above, p. 28 f.).
   (93 B.C. [Obs. 52] – Fregellae was almost certainly *ager publicus* or Roman colonial land by this date ; see A. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy*, II, 710).

8. Hadria (Picenum).
   214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,10).
   194 B.C. (Livy 34.45,8).

9. Setia (Latium).
   204 B.C. (Livy 29.14,2 f.).
10. Spoletium (Umbria).
    214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,10).
    91 B.C. (Obs. 54).
11. Suessa Aurunca (Campania).
    199 B.C. (Livy 32.1,10).
    198 B.C. (Livy 32.9,2).

II. Federate Allies (227).

A. Relatively more certain.

(Cisalpine Gaul)

1. Mantua – 214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,7).

(Umbria)

2. and 3. Ameria and Tuder – 104/3 (or 102) B.C. (Obs. 43, et al.)
4. Urvinum – 95 B.C. (Obs. 50).

(Etruria)

5. Arretium – 198 B.C. (Livy 32.9,3).
   192 B.C. (Livy 35.21,3).
   108 B.C. (Obs. 40).
   96 B.C. (Obs. 49).
   93 B.C. (Obs. 52).
   92 B.C. (Obs. 53).
   91 B.C. (Obs. 54).

(227) Compiling a list for Italian *socii* is more difficult than for the Latin colonies. In some cases there is uncertainty as to the identification of the place-name, and so as to its status. There is also uncertainty about the juridical status of some well known places. In a number of cases there is a significant possibility that the prodigy occurred on Roman *ager publicus* ; this possibility is relatively great in Apulia, Lucania and Bruttium after ca. 200 B.C. In general, geographical notices are often unspecific. For example, in addition to being told of various named Etruscan cities, we are also sometimes told only that prodigies occurred *in Etruria* or *in Tuscis*. This is true also of Umbria, Apulia, Lucania and Bruttium.

For the juridical status of places I follow K. J. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der Punischen Kriege* (1926) ; A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy*, 2 vols. (1965) ; A. Afzelius, *Die Römische Eroberung Italiens : 340-254 v. Chr.* (1942), and for Etruscan and Umbrian places, Harris, *op. cit.* I have found most of the conclusions of E. Ruoff-Väänänen, "The Roman Public Prodigia and the Ager Romanus", *Arctos*, 17 (1972), 139 ff. unconvincing. Full argumentation on all doubtful points would run to excessive length ; I have been conservative in compiling the list.

Localities are grouped geographically, roughly from north to south.

6. Faesulae – 96 B.C. (Obs. 49).
   94 B.C. (Obs. 51).
   92 B.C. (Obs. 53).
7. Perusia – 106 B.C. (Obs. 41).
8. Tarquinii – 210 B.C. (Livy 27.4,14).
   104/3 B.C. (Obs. 43).
   100 B.C. (Obs. 45).
9. Volaterrae – 92 B.C. (Obs. 53).
10. Volsinii – 208 B.C. (Livy 27.23,3).
    104/3 B.C. (Obs. 43).
    94 B.C. (Obs. 51).
    93 B.C. (Obs. 52).

(Latium and central Italy)

11. Ager Ferentinus – 133 B.C. (Obs. 27).
12. Praeneste – 217 B.C. (Livy 22.9).
    214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,10).
    166 B.C. (Obs. 12).
    140 B.C. (Obs. 23).
    137 B.C. (Obs. 24).
    117 B.C. (Obs. 36).
    93 B.C. (Obs. 52).
13. Marrucini – 214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,7).

(Samnium)

14. Compsa – 213 B.C. (Livy 24.44,9).
    154 B.C. (Obs. 17).

(Apulia)

15. Arpi – 217 B.C. (Livy 22.1,9).
    125 B.C. (Obs. 30).
16. *Apulia* – 214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,7).

B. Relatively less certain (228).

(Cispadane Gaul ?)

1. Regium – 136 B.C. (Obs. 25).
   91 B.C. (Obs. 54).

(228) The following fifteen items are rendered less certain for a variety of reasons – vague or uncertain location, uncertain juridical status, or the possibility of *ager publicus* in the area at the time the prodigy was reported. Argumentation on specific cases is omitted.

(Etruria)

2. *Etruria* or *Tusci* – 223 B.C. (Oros. 4.13,12 et al.).
   102 B.C. (Obs. 44).
3. Clusium (for corrupt *clusa* ?) – 102 B.C. (Obs. 44).

(Latium and central Italy)

4. Vestini – 94 B.C. (Obs. 51).
   91 B.C. (Obs. 54).
5. Falerii – 217 B.C. (Livy 22.1,10).
6. Fucine lake – 137 B.C. (Obs. 24).
7. Gabii – 214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,9).
   176 B.C. (Livy 41.16,6).
   163 B.C. (Obs. 14).
8. Lavinium – 137 B.C. (Obs. 24).
9. Ager Trebulanus – 106 B.C. (Obs. 41).

(Campania)

10. Nuceria – 104 B.C. (Obs. 43).
11. Aenaria (Pithecusae, Ischia) – 91 B.C. (Obs. 54).
12. Teanum Sidicinum – 166 B.C. (Pbs. 12).

(Apulia)

13. *Apulia* – 130 B.C. (Obs. 28).
    93 B.C. (Obs. 52).

(Lucania)

14. *in Lucanis* – 200 B.C. (Livy 31.12,5).
    113 B.C. (Obs. 38).
    104 B.C. (Obs. 43).
    93 B.C. (Obs. 52).

(Bruttium)

15. *ex Bruttis* – 199 B.C. (Livy 32.1,11).

There are sixteen towns or regions in the "more certain" category; a total of thirty-six prodigy reports. There are fifteen towns or regions in the "less certain" category; a total of twenty-four prodigy reports. Of the thirty-six "more certain" reports, four occur indisputably within the confines of the city proper, so that any possibility of *ager publicus* is excluded. These are: Faesulae, 94 B.C.; Praeneste, 214 B.C.; Compsa, 213 B.C.; Arretium, 92 B.C.

III. Extra-Italian areas.

A. Prodigies "in castris".
1. Gallia (229) – 218 B.C. (Livy 21.62).
102 B.C. (Obs. 44).
2. Sicilia – 217 B.C. (Livy 22.1,8).
3. Sardinia – 217 B.C. (Livy 22.1,8).
4. Macedonia – 199 B.C. (Livy 31.1,12).

B. Prodigies among civilians.
1. Sicily and the Lipari islands (230).
214 B.C. (Livy 24.10,10).
183 B.C. (Livy 39,56,5 ; Oros. 4,20,30).
177 B.C. (Livy 41.13,3).
140 B.C. (Obs. 23).
135 B.C. (Obs. 26).
126 B.C. (Obs. 29 ; Oros. 5.10,11 ; Strabo 6.2.11 ; Pliny, *NH* 2.203).
122 B.C. (Obs. 32).
90/88 B.C. (Pliny, *NH* 2.238 ; cf. Strabo 6.2,11).
2. Cephallenia – 163 B.C. (Obs. 14).
140 B.C. (Obs. 23).
3. Cyrene – 125 B.C. (Obs. 30).
4. Rhodes – 223 B.C. (Oros. 4.13,12 ; Dio, frag. 12 ; Plut., *Marc.* 4).
5. Antioch on Maeander – 45/54 A.D. (Phlegon, frag. 35 M.).

Prodigies occurring among civilians are reported from five overseas areas. Three of these (Sicily, Cephallenia, and Antioch) were provincial or protectorate areas at the time of the occurrence of the prodigy.

The remaining two notices (Cyrene in 125 B.C. and Rhodes in 223 B.C.) are suspect. The entire list for 223 B.C. (given to us variously by Dio, Orosius, and Plutarch) is suspicious in that it is so clearly part of the

(229) Not, of course, extra-peninsular, nor yet "provincial" in the later sense of the term, but still "extra-Italian" during the period in which these prodigies occur.

(230) For the political geography of Sicily, see Toynbee, ii, 212-21 ; V. M. Scramuzza, "Roman Sicily" in T. Frank, *ESAR*, iii (1937), 326 ff. ; J. Carcopino, *La loi d'Hiéron et les Romains* (1914), 240 ff.

tale of C. Flaminius' sacrilegious behavior. Our faith in this list is not increased by Orosius' inclusion in it of the collapse of the colossus of Rhodes (which did, in fact, occur in or close to this year) which will hardly have been treated by the Romans as a public prodigy pertaining to themselves. The pestilence in Cyrene (given in about the same way in Obs. 30 ; Livy, per. 60 ; Oros. 5.11 ; and Aug., *CD* 3.31 – that is, all ultimately from Livy) is also extremely unlikely to have been treated as a public prodigy. This is surely an example of a marvellous tale (whether factual or not) which appeared in Livy's narrative.

If the Rhodian and Cyrenian prodigies are eliminated, as they surely must be, then there is no indication that a prodigy was ever officially accepted from a foreign country (even an ally, which Ptolemaic Cyrene was) in which there was no official Roman presence.

The total number of genuine extra-Italian reports is thus sixteen ; ranging from 218 B.C. to 45/54 A.D. Of these, nine are from Sicily, of which only the first (in 217 B.C.) is military. Of the nine, six are volcanic or seismic phenomena involving Mt. Aetna or the Liparis. The table below summarizes the data.

	Number of Places	Number of Reporting Years	Period
(1) Latin colonies	11	19	269-91 B.C.
(2) More certain allies	16	36	217-91 B.C.
(3) Less certain allies	15	24	223-91 B.C.
(4) Extra-Italian (civilian)	3*	11	214 B.C.-45/54 A.D.
(5) Extra-Italian	4*	5	218-102 B.C.
Minimum total (excluding lines 3 and 5)	30	66	
Maximum total	49	95	

* The designations "Sicilia", "Aetna", "Lipara", and "Syracuse" are considered as a single place – Sicily. Cyrene and Rhodes are excluded. Transpadane Gaul, as noted above, is considered "extra-Italian".

SUMMARY

(1) Prodigies are reported from 106 named cities or regions (including Rome). The proportion of this number of the *minimum total* of peregrine prodigy locales (that is, Latin colonies, "more certain" federate allies, and extra-Italian civilian) is *30/106 = 28 %*. The proportion of this number of the *maximum total* is *49/106 = 46 %*.

(2) From a total of 105 locales (this time excluding the city of Rome) there are 306 separate prodigy reports ([231]). The proportion of this number of the *minimum total* of peregrine prodigy reports is *66/306 = 21 %*. The proportion of the *maximum total* is *95/306 = 31 %*.

Thus, the proportion of the minimum number of peregrine, civilian prodigy reporting locales is more than one-quarter of the total, and they account for approximately one-fifth of the total number of reports from all places exclusive of Rome itself.

(3) Wülker does not list (and I have not attempted to count) the total number of prodigy reports from Rome itself. But we will not be far off if we take this as about the same as the number of reports from all other places combined, since Rome reports a prodigy, or prodigies, in almost every year that any other place does, and the few years in which there is no report from Rome are probably about balanced by those few years in which only Rome reports prodigies. So, roughly, doubling 306 to 600, the proportion of peregrine prodigy reports of the total number of all reports ranges from a *minimum of 66/600 = 11 %* to a *maximum* of *95/600 = 16 %*.

(231) Consult Wülker's table of prodigy locales (*op. cit.*, 94-101). He has overlooked reports from Aetna in 140 and 135, the Liparis in 90/88, Lacus Fucinus in 137, Lavinium in 137, and Setia in 204 B.C.

APPENDIX C : GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF PRODIGIES BY REGION

Regions are listed in descending order of overall numbers of prodigy reports. After the aggregate numbers for each region, all reporting cities in the region are listed with their total numbers of reports. (Note : these are not numbers of prodigies but numbers of distinct reports – typically only one in any year – which may contain one or several prodigies for each particular place). An italicized name = a Latin colony ; an (*) = a more certain federate ally ; a (**) = a foreign or provincial territory. These designated peregrine places have at least one, and, in most cases, all of their prodigy reports in the period prior to the Social War.

Latium : named cities (excluding Rome) : 32.
cities with six or more reports : 8.
total prodigy reports : 116.

Aefula-1 ; Anagnia-8 ; Antium-3 ; *Ardea*-2 ; Aricia-6 ; Arpinum-1 ; Caieta-2 ; Cassinum-3 ; *Carseoli*-1 ; Cora-1 ; Crustumerium-1 ; Formiae-6 ; *Fregellae*-3 ; Frusino-7 ; Gabii-3 ; Lanuvium-15 ; Ager Latiniensis-1 ; Minturnae-4 ; Lavinium-1 ; Ostia-4 ; Ager Pomptinus-1 ; Praeneste*-7 ; Privernum-6 ; Satricum-1 ; *Setia*-1 ; Sinuessa-5 ; Tarracina-11 ; Tusculum-3 ; Velitrae-3 ; Venafrum-1 ; Volsci-1 ; *Suessa Aurunca*-3.

Campania : named cities : 13, plus one reference to "Campani".
Cities with six or more reports : 2.
Total prodigy reports : 37.

Aenaria-1 ; Atella-2 ; Calatia-2 ; *Cales*-2 ; 'Campania'-3 ; Capua-10 ; Cumae-7 ; Nuceria-1 ; Pompeii-1 ; Puteoli-3 ; Teanum Sidicinum-1 ; Volturnum-1 ; Ager (or campus) Stellatis-2 ; Suessula-1.

Sabineland : named cities : 7 (taking 'Sabini' as = Cures)
cities with six or more reports : 3.
total prodigy reports : 33.

Alba Fucens-1 ; Amiternum-8 ; Eretum-1 ; Nursia-4 ; Reate-10 ; Sabini-6 ; Trebula Mutuesca-3.

Central and North Etruria : named cities : 10.
cities with six or more reports : 1.
total prodigy reports : 27.

Arretium*-7 ; Clusium-1 ; Faesulae*-3 ; Graviscae-1 ; Luna-3 ; Perusia*-1 ; Saturnia-3 ; Tarquinii*-3 ; Volaterrae*-1 ; Volsinii*-4.

South Etruria & Ager Faliscus : named cities : 5.
cities with six or more reports : 2.
total prodigy reports : 21.

Caere-9 ; Capena-3 ; Falerii-1 ; Veii-7 ; Fregenae-1.

Non-specific reference to Etruria or Tusci : Number of references : 2.
total prodigy reports : 2.

Ager Gallicus : named cities : 2, plus one reference to "ager Gallicus".
total prodigy reports : 11.

Ariminum-4 ; Ager Gallicus-5 ; Pisaurum-2.

Picenum : named cities : 2, plus one reference to "Picenum".
total prodigy reports : 11.

Auximum-2 ; *Hadria*-2 ; Picenum-7.

Sicily** (including Syracuse, Aetna, the Liparis) : total prodigy reports : 9.

Umbria : named cities : 4, plus one reference to "Umbria".
total prodigy reports : 6.

Ameria* and Tuder*-1 ; *Spoletium*-3 ; Umbria-1 ; Urvinum*-1.

Lucania : named cities : none (all references are to "Lucani").
total prodigy reports : 6.

Apulia : named cities : 1, plus 3 references to "Apulia".
total prodigy reports : 5.

Arpi*-2 ; Apulia*-3.

East Central Italy : named populi : 2, plus one reference to Lacus Fucinus
total prodigy reports : 4.

Marrucini*-1 ; Vestini-2 ; Lacus Fucinus-1.

Samnium : named cities : 1.
total prodigy reports : 2.

Compsa*-2.

Bruttium : named cities : 1, plus one reference to "Bruttii".
total prodigy reports : 2.

Croton-1 ; Bruttii-1.

Cispadane Gaul : named cities : 2.
total prodigy reports : 2.

Bononia-1 ; Mutina-1.

Cephallenia**: total prodigy reports : 2.

Transpadane Gaul : named cities : 1.
total prodigy reports : 1.

Mantua*-1.

Sardinia** : total prodigy reports : 1.

Province of Asia** : named cities : 1.
total prodigy reports : 1.

Antioch on Maeander**-1.

Macedonia** : total prodigy reports : 1.

Italy-locations uncertain : named cities : 5.
total reports : 6.

Ager Ferentinus (probably Latium)-1 ; Regium (probably = Regium Lepidi in the Po Valley)-2 ; Forum Esii (unknown)-1 ; Forum Subertanum (unknown)-1 ; Capsa (unknown)-1.

There is a total of 306 prodigy reports exclusive of those from Rome itself. Of these, 14 are extra-peninsular (from Sicily, Sardinia, Macedonia, Cephallenia, and Antioch), and six are from towns or *fora* in Italy whose locations are unknown. Subtracting these 20 reports leaves a total of 286 reports from definitely located cities, regions, or *populi* in the Italian peninsula. There are 91 such definitely located places or regions in Italy.

The 32 towns of Latium which report prodigies (excluding Rome itself) thus account for 35 per cent of the total of 91 places, and the total number of prodigy reports from these 32 towns accounts for 41 per cent of the total of 286 reports.

The next three most heavily reporting areas are Campania to the south, Sabineland to the east, and Etruria to the north. The contiguous area of Latium and these three adjoining regions forms the heartland of prodigy reporting. This area accounts for 75 per cent of all locateable Italian places and 82 per cent of their reports. (The percentage of Latian reports would, of course, be still higher if we included those from Rome itself).

Basically, the geographical distribution of prodigy reports can be accounted for simply in terms of distance from Rome. Extreme northern and southern Italy account for very few reports. There are, however,

some anomalies in this picture. Umbria produces surprisingly few reports in view of the fact that it is contiguous with Etruria and Sabineland (which report heavily) and was a heavily urbanized area. Picenum and the Ager Gallicus, on the other hand, produce surprisingly many reports in view of their distance from Rome ; and in neither case is the high total due to the heavy reporting of some one city. Also anomalous is the under-representation of the Oscan peoples of east-central Italy. The Marrucini and Vestini produce three reports altogether, the Marsi possibly one (a prodigy from the Lacus Fucinus which might better be attributed to Alba Fucens), the Paeligni none. The Samnites are almost unrepresented, with only two reports – both from Compsa. Altogether the Oscan peoples of central Italy produce no more prodigy reports than Lucania, and far fewer than Lucania, Apulia, and Bruttium combined. Distance or difficulty of communication hardly seems to be an adequate explanation for this, and so we must suppose that some other factor is at work. No definitive answer seems possible. We can only suggest that it is not unrelated to the abiding hostility which Romans felt for the Samnites and those other Oscan *populi* who eventually, in 90 B.C., combined to form the anti-Rome, Italia.

APPENDIX D : PATTERNS OF HARUSPICIAL ACTIVITY

This appendix presents data on types of prodigies and types of *responsa* which characterize the activity of the haruspices at Rome. It need not be pointed out that the total numbers of events counted are very small, that most instances of prodigies occur in groups for which our notices indicate only a single expiation for the group "*en masse*" which in many cases may be misleading, and that for many of the prodigy types listed the number of instances which cannot be securely assigned to any priesthood equals or exceeds the number which can. The data, therefore, are unsatisfactory to say the least. Nevertheless, it seems worthwhile to present at least that much of the data as may evoke a small degree of confidence.

I. Prodigy types which appear to be fairly or highly characteristic of the haruspices.

1. Persons struck by lightning [232].

   Haruspices : 114 B.C., 86 B.C., 363 A.D. = 3.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 295 B.C., 217 B.C., 216 B.C., 190 B.C. = 4.

2. Talking cows or oxen.

   Haruspices : 214 B.C., 192 B.C., 43 B.C. = 3.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 461 B.C., 218 B.C., 206 B.C., (169 B.C.?) = 3 or 4.

3. Cows or oxen behaving strangely in other ways.

   haruspices : 191 B.C., 177 B.C. = 2.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 218 B.C. = 1.

4. Visual or auditory apparitions (ghosts, phantom battles, mysterious sounds from the sky).

   Haruspices : 214 B.C. (bis), 104/3 B.C., 88 B.C., 43 B.C. = 5.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 218 B.C. (bis), 213 B.C., 173 B.C. = 4.

(232) See above, p. 50 ff., on haruspicial responses to lightning.

5. Talking infants.

   Haruspices : 214 B.C., 56/52 B.C., 43 B.C. = 3.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 218 B.C. = 1.

6. Statues and/or columns struck by lightning (232).

   Haruspices : 278 B.C., ca. 278-250 B.C., 172 B.C., 65 B.C., 43 B.C. = 5.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 172 B.C., 56 B.C. = 2.

7. Monstrous human births (other than androgynes) or women bearing non-human offspring.

   Haruspices : "undated-early", 136 B.C., 83 B.C., 47 B.C., 112 A.D. = 5.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 194 B.C. (bis) = 2.

8. Destructive storms or whirlwinds.

   Haruspices : 182 B.C., 152 B.C., 121 B.C. = 3.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : 179 B.C. = 1.

9. Sex change in humans.

   Haruspices : 214 B.C., 171 B.C. = 2.
   Xuiri or Pontiffs : none.

10. Flames from the earth.

    Haruspices : 104/3 B.C., 90 B.C. = 2.
    Xuiri or Pontiffs : none.

11. Swarms of bees.

    Haruspices : 214 B.C., 48 B.C., 42 B.C. = 3.
    Xuiri or Pontiffs : 193 B.C.-b (wasps), 118 B.C. (233) = 2 ?

12. Subterranean *fremitus*.

    Haruspices : (99 B.C.?), (97 B.C.?), 56 B.C. = 1 to 3.
    Xuiri or Pontiffs : 262 A.D. = 1.

It will be noted that there are few prodigy types which were not handled on at least one occasion that we know of by some group other than haruspices. Haruspices appear to have monopolized, at most, instances of sex change in humans, flames shooting from the earth, and, we must suppose, swarms of bees, although numbers of assignable instances are so small that it would be foolish to put great weight on them. For all of the twelve prodigy types listed above, however, haruspices

(233) In view of the literary evidence which associates this prodigy closely with haruspices it seems most likely that Obs. 35 (for 118 B.C.) in in error (cf. Pliny, *NH*, 11.55 ; Cic., *Har. Resp.*, 25).

appear to have been consulted about as often, if not a little more often, than the other groups. By contrast, there are many prodigy types for which haruspices appear to have been consulted not at all or considerably less frequently than other groups (234).

II. Haruspicial *responsa*.

Here we list the occurrences of the various kinds of responses – both expiatory acts and interpretations – of the haruspices as recorded in our sources and compare them to the numbers of similar responses given by the *decemuiri*, pontiffs, or senate. The same caution which we expressed above concerning the small numbers of certain events applies here as well.

A. Expiatory acts.

a. Not characteristic of haruspices.

1. sacrifice of *hostiae maiores* : 1 occurrence (214 B.C.) as against 13 for other groups, and 9 unassigned. There is a strong presumption that Livy's evidence for this haruspicial response is incorrect.
2. recommendation of *ludi* in honor of a deity : 1 occurrence (65 B.C.) as against 6 for other groups.
3. lustration of the city : 2 occurrences (102 B.C., 55 A.D.) as against 6 for other groups and 8 unassigned.
4. *supplicatio* : 2 occurrences (199 B.C., 177 B.C.) as against 32 for other groups and 20 uncertain.
5. *nouemdiale sacrum* for a rain of stones : 1 apocryphal occurrence (reign of Tullus) ; one historical occurrence (102 B.C.) in which haruspices may recommend the rite, though Obsequens' abbreviated summary obscures this ; and one further occurrence (43 B.C.) in which haruspices respond to a rain of stones though the *nouemdiale sacrum* is not mentioned, as against 3 or 4 for other groups and 11 or 12 unassigned. (From the fictitious attribution of the invention of the rite to haruspices in the reign of Tullus and from Cicero's statement (*Diu*. I 98) that haruspices frequently agreed with *decemuiri* in the case of rains of stones, it seems certain that they did on at least some occasions, recommend this act.)

(234) See WÜLKER, *op. cit.*, 6-22 for lists of prodigies by type.

6. *stips* or gift to a deity : 2 occurrences (207 B.C., 104/3 B.C.) as against 4 for other groups.

b. Fairly characteristic of haruspices.

1. disposal of a prodigy by burning : 3 occurrences (191 B.C., 136 B.C., 91 B.C.) as against 1 for other groups and 1 unassigned.
2. preserving and nurturing a talking cow : 1 definite occurrence (192 B.C.) and one very probable (177 B.C.-b) as against 1 possible occurrence for the *Xuiri* in 169 B.C. (although Livy's presentation is unclear [43.13, 3-8]) and 1 unassigned.

c. Exclusively characteristic of haruspices.

1. Disposal of a prodigy by drowning : 11 certain and 2 virtually certain occurrences for androgynes (see App. V) plus 2 other non-androgyne cases (83 B.C., 112 A.D.) ; none recorded for any other group.
2. Disposal of a *monstrum* by deportation : 1 apocryphal occurrence ("undated-early") and 1 historical occurrence (171 B.C.) ; none recorded for any other group.

It is to be noted that the most characteristic haruspicial expiations involve disposing of *monstra* in one fashion or another. The least characteristic haruspicial expiations are those which are most characteristic of the *decemuiri*, recommendation of *supplicationes* and sacrifice of *hostiae maiores*.

In addition we may note four other expiatory acts which are unique to haruspices but which are all single (and exceptional ?) occurrences : presentation of two armed, olive-wood statues (104/3 B.C.), recommendation of sacrifice to Apollo (99 B.C.-a), ordering the destruction of the temple of Isis (48 B.C.), and circumvallating a prodigious spot (42 B.C. – unless this is, in fact, the standard expiation for a swarm of bees although mentioned nowhere else).

B. Haruspicial interpretations.

The examples which we listed above under expiatory acts are, for the most part, recorded in our sources without reference to any accompanying interpretation of the prodigy. But interpretation was more characteristic of the haruspices than expiation. Below we list references to haruspicial interpretations and to those expiatory acts which clearly presuppose an interpretation. We have attempted a rough typology,

dividing the interpretations, in part, among those which are either favorable or unfavorable and (with less certainty) among those which seem to rely clearly on allegory or association of ideas and those which do not – although in these cases it may only be that the allegory is not clear to us. I have included apocryphal instances, as above, because while they are not historical they are nonetheless illuminating.

a. Interpretation or expiations involving position or orientation.
   1. The Capitoline head – in Dionysius' version the haruspex traces quadrants on the ground in order to locate the prodigy for the purpose of capturing the omen.
   2. Ca. 278-250 B.C. – the statue of Horatius is relocated with respect to elevation and sunlight.
   3. 278 B.C. – Summanus' head is located in the Tiber presumably through the ability of the haruspices to chart the direction of the lightning bolt.
   4. 86 B.C. – an haruspex in Sulla's army predicts his capture of Athens from the orientation of a dead soldier struck by lightning.
   5. 65 B.C. – a statue of Jupiter struck by lightning is relocated with respect to elevation and the direction of the sunrise (cf. no. 2).

b. Allegorical interpretation – favorable.
   1. Capitoline head – the head portends that Rome will be the "head" of Italy.
   2. 296 B.C. – of the several prodigies that occur, some are interpreted favorably by the Etruscan seer, Manius : a statue found standing on the ground facing the direction of the Gauls means that Victory has gone forward ; blood flowing from the altar of Jupiter portends victory because the altars are stained with blood only after sacrifices in honor of victory.
   3. 172 B.C. – a *columna rostrata* struck by lightning portends victory for the Romans (in the war against Perseus) because the column had been taken as booty from the Greeks.
   4. 130 B.C. – The statue of Apollo at Cumae weeping portends success for the Romans and sorrow for the Greeks because Cumae was a Greek colony.
   5. 90 B.C. – a flame springing from earth to heaven portends that a brave and handsome man (Sulla) will take charge of the government.

c. Allegorical interpretation – unfavorable.
   1. 296 B.C. (see above, b-2) honey flowing from an altar portends disease since invalids crave it ; milk flowing from an altar portends famine since the Romans will have to search for food of spontaneous origin.

2. 114 B.C. – Helvia and her horse struck by lightning portends *infamia* for the Virgins and the equestrian order.
3. 88 B.C. – a sparrow carrying a grasshopper into the temple of Bellona portends dissension between landowners and city populace since the latter are noisy like the grasshopper and the former haunt the fields like the sparrow.
4. 65 B.C. – lightning striking the statues of Jupiter and Romulus and the tablets of the laws portends bloodshed, fire, the downfall of the laws, civil war, and the fall of the city and the empire unless the gods are placated.
5. 54 B.C. (b) – lumps of iron like sponges falling in Lucania portend 'wounds from above' (*supera volnera*).
6. 47 B.C. – the birth of infants holding their left hands to their heads portends an uprising of inferiors against superiors.
7. 64 A.D. (b) – a calf born near the roadside with its head attached to its leg portends that a new head is being prepared for the human race, but it will not be strong or secret because it was repressed in the womb and issued by a road. (Evidently a reference – suspiciously prescient – to the Pisonian conspiracy).
8. 363 A.D. – the death of a soldier and war-horses by lightning means that a military expedition must be abandoned.

d. Non-allegorical – unfavorable.

1. 152 B.C. – a column with a golden statue in front of the temple of Jupiter thrown down by a wind portends death to all priests and magistrates (which they avoid by abdicating).
2. 126 B.C. – an explosion of Mt. Aetna with accompanying dead fish and pestilence portends sedition.
3. 102 B.C. – lightning striking a temple of Jupiter (at Clusium ?) portends destruction to the haruspices and their children.
4. Ca. 90 B.C. (a) – shields at Lanuvium gnawed by mice is considered *tristissimum*.
5. 88 B.C. – the sound of a trumpet from the sky portends the advent of a new *saeculum*.
6. 56 B.C. (b) – a *strepitus cum fremitu* in the *ager Latiniensis* signals the anger of Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Tellus, and the *Di Caelestes* because of certain acts of neglect and sacrilege; if they are not placated, then the prodigy portends civil discord, defeat, revolution, etc.
7. 56/52 B.C. – a forty-nine day old infant speaking portends destruction.

8. 43 B.C. – a collection of nine prodigies is interpreted by the oldest haruspex to mean that kingly rule is returning and all will be slaves except himself (he commits suicide).
9. Undated (early) – the birth of a baby girl with a full set of teeth portends destruction to whatever town she is banished to.

e. Interpretations which do not involve prediction.

1. 483 B.C. – celestial prodigies and prodigies in the city and fields are interpreded by *uates* (if this is taken as = haruspices) as a sign that *haud rite sacra fieri.*
2. 472 B.C. – (probably a doublet of the above) various prodigies, including pestilence, are interpreted by *manteis* as a sign that rites are not being duly performed. (In both 483 and 472 the source of the impurity is an unchaste Vestal).

f. Interpretations which are simply a statement of what the gods require the Romans to do in order to have victory, prosperity, etc.

1. 362 B.C. – the prodigy of the Lacus Curtius : (a) the *vates* (according to Livy) say that that in which the Romans are most strong must be thrown into the chasm if the Roman state is to be *perpetua* ; (b) haruspices (according to Procilius in Varro) say that the *di Manes* demand the life of the bravest citizen as a *postilio*. (Note : virtually the same response is attributed to the Sibylline Books in the version of Dionysius).
2. 398 B.C. – the prodigy of the Alban Lake : the Old Man of Veii states that whenever the Lake floods, if the Romans drain it correctly, they will be given victory over Veii. He then tells them how this is to be done. (Note : virtually the same response is attributed to the Delphic oracle).

g. The following interpretations are unassigned in our sources but are very likely to be haruspicial.

1. ca. 171/168 B.C. – (Pliny, *NH* 17, 244) – At Rome during the war with Perseus a palm tree grew up on the altar of Jupiter on the Capitol portending victory and triumphal processions.
2. 129 B.C. (Obs. 28a) – two black snakes which crept into the cella of Minerva portended civil bloodshed.
3. 99 B.C. (a) – the sound of a *fremitus* which appeared to rise from beneath the earth to as high as the sky portended scarcity and famine.
4. 97 B.C. (Obs. 48) – a *fremitus* and the collapse of part of a wall at Pisaurum portended civil discord.
5. 50 B.C. (Obs. 65) – a mule giving birth portended the death of respectable citizens, change in the laws, and shameful offspring of the matrons.

The distinctive character of haruspicial interpretations can be seen by contrast with Sibylline oracles, Delphic oracles procured by the Romans, and the *carmina Marciana* – all products of the *decemviral* college.

1. Only haruspicial interpretations and expiations show a concern with position and orientation – particularly of statues (sec. a, 1-5).
2. Many haruspicial interpretations are obviously allegorical (sec. b and c) ; only one Sibylline oracle appears allegorical – Pliny, *NH* 17.243 (ca. 50 B.C.) : a tree near Cumae sank into the ground leaving only its branches sticking out and a Sibylline oracle predicted *internecionem hominum fore, tantoque eam maiorem quanto propius ab urbe portentum factum esset*. It may be significant that this exceptional Sibylline oracle, which sounds very haruspicial, is quite late.
3. Only haruspicial interpretations see the prodigy as favorable (secs. a-4 and b). For this reason g-1 is most likely to be haruspicial.
4. Haruspicial interpretations do not typically tell what to do about the prodigy [235]. By contrast, this is the commonest type of *decemviral* oracle : cf. 398 B.C., 362 B.C., 348 B.C. (the conjectural date for the institution of the *Ludi Tarentini*), 216 B.C. (Delphic oracle), 212 B.C. (the second of the Marcian oracles), 205 B.C., 114 B.C., 87 B.C. 56 B.C. (a).
5. The commonest form of haruspicial interpretation is that the prodigy portends something for the future – whether favorable or unfavorable (secs. b, c, and d). By contrast, this is the least typical *decemviral* type (cf. 461 B.C., 228 B.C., 225 B.C., 212 B.C. (the first Marcian oracle), 87 B.C., and ca. 50 B.C. – altogether six out of a total of nineteen Sibylline, Delphic, or Marcian oracles. On this basis, g-2, 3, 4 and 5 should probably be ascribed to the haruspices.
6. Haruspicial interpretations frequently predict civil strife, bloodshed and discord in unambiguous terms (secs. c-3, 4, 6 ; d-2, 6, 8 ; (g-2, 4, 5). No Sibylline oracle predicts civil disturbance in such vivid language, although those for 461 B.C., 87 B.C., and 50 B.C. contain ambiguous allusions to *seditio* or strife. By contrast, Sibylline and other *decemviral* oracles are far more often concerned with the danger of foreign invasion or war with non-Romans than are haruspicial interpretations (cf. the *decemviral* oracles for 461, 398, 348, 228, 225, 216, 212, 205, 143 (a) B.C. and the haruspicial *responsa*, a-4 ; b-2, 3 and 4 ; c-5 and 8 ; f-2).

(235) a-2 and 5 are exceptions to this. f-1 and 2 are both not only unhistorical but have clearly been concocted to be identical to either a Sibylline or a Delphic oracle procured for the same occasion. e-1 and 2 and d-6 do not clearly tell what to do although they imply that something should be done.

III. Conclusions.

From the data presented above in sections I and II it appears that the haruspicial contribution to Roman *Prodigienwesen* may have consisted in part in a heightened attention to certain prodigy types (lightning, monstrous births, sex change, flames from the earth, swarms of bees, *fremitus*) for which haruspices appear to have had an affinity. (It should be noted, however, that the majority of instances of all of these prodigy types do not come from Etruscan cities). Their most substantial contribution, however, both with respect to these prodigy types and others, was a unique style of interpretation. It was haruspices who introduced to the Romans the concept that a prodigy portends something beyond itself, and, indeed, that it may portend something favorable – a prediction never met with in Sibylline oracles [236]. Romans appear to have had no difficulty in accepting these novelties from the haruspices once their initial suspicion of the foreigners (which we detected in certain anecdotes about them) had dissipated. Nevertheless, it remains true, as has often been said, that the haruspices never tried, or, at any rate, never succeeded, in imposing the Etruscan religion on Rome. Rather, they conformed to Roman religious ideas and forms of worship – influencing them perhaps to a degree and complimenting them with some contributions of their own but never radically opposing them. Foreign influences introduced into Roman religion by the Roman *decemuiri* were far greater than any which can be ascribed to the Etruscan haruspices.

(236) See Bloch, *op. cit.*, 49 ff.

APPENDIX E : THE ANDROGYNE EXPIATIONS

The occurrence of androgynous human births represents the single occasion, so far we are informed, on which *decemuiri* and haruspices repeatedly collaborated in the performance of the expiatory ritual : the haruspices having the task of drowning the *monstrum* at sea enclosed in a wooden chest while the *decemuiri* conducted lustral processions and supervised offerings to Juno Regina on the Aventine and, at a later stage, to Ceres, Proserpina and other deities as well. The androgyne expiation is of interest not only as an example of collaboration between the two priesthoods but also because, uniquely among Roman expiatory rites, its genesis and development can be traced in two well-documented stages over a period of more than a century from its inception in 207 B.C.

My analysis of the expiation of 207 and of the political and military situation in that year by which I believe it was shaped has been presented in Chapter V and need not be repeated here (237). The purpose of this appendix is to present a summary of the androgyne prodigies and expiations and to discuss briefly the development of the ritual.

The androgyne prodigies :

209 B.C. (L. 27.11, 1-6) : *Sinuessae natum ambiguo inter marem ac feminam sexu infantem*. This is the earliest certain reference to an androgynous birth (238). The entire group of prodigies in which it occurs was expiated with sacrifice, *supplicatio* and *obsecratio*. The androgyne was apparently not singled out for separate attention.

(237) Above, p. 65 ff.

(238) Livy, 24.10, 10 for 214 B.C. includes a notice that at Spoletium *ex muliere uirum factum*. This was cited by Hermann Diels (*Sibyllinische Blätter* [Berlin, 1890], ch. 8) as the first occurrence of an androgyne in our sources. The phenomenon may indeed be the same, but this and several other instances of miraculous sex change from female to male in later life (the opposite transformation does not occur) clearly formed a separate conceptual category and were at all times handled differently from androgynous births (cf. Pliny, *NH*, 7.36 for 171 B.C. ; Diod., 32.12, 12 for 90 B.C. ; and Phlegon, *Mirab.*, 6 (= *FGrHist.*, ii B 257) for 45 A.D.).

207 B.C. (L. 27.37, 4-15) : *Frusinone natum esse infantem quadrimo parem ... ut Sinuessae biennio ante, incertus mas an femina esset ...* This is the first androgyne to receive a distinctive expiation. It was condemned as *foedum ac turpe* by the haruspices and drowned at sea by them. This was followed by the collection of a donation from the matrons and the presentation of a golden bowl by them to Juno Regina on the Aventine at the recommendation of the haruspices and under the supervision of the curule aediles. Then followed a procession to Juno's temple of twenty-seven *uirgines* singing a hymn which had been composed by Livius Andronicus. This procession had been ordered by the pontiffs and was conducted by the *decemuiri* who, at its culmination, sacrificed two white cows and presented two cypress wood statues to Juno.

200 B.C. (L. 31.12, 5-10) : *In Sabinis incertus infans natus masculus an femina esset, alter sedecim iam annorum item ambiguo sexu inuentus.* Of the expiation for these two androgynes Livy says that they were ordered to be carried out to sea just as had most recently been done in the consulship of C. Claudius and M. Livius (207 B.C.). The haruspices are not named in connection with this but are obviously to be understood. Livy goes on to say that "nevertheless (the Senate) ordered the *decemuiri* to approach the Books concerning the prodigy and the *decemuiri* commanded the performance of the same rites (*res diuinas easdem*) as had been performed recently when the same prodigy had occurred." He concludes by saying, however, that "in addition they ordered that a hymn be sung by thrice-nine maidens through the city and that a gift be offered to Juno Regina". This concluding sentence is redundant and Livy has evidently confused his source. The procession of maidens and the gift should be understood as the content of *res diuinas easdem*, not as additional acts. We may gather then that the ritual of 200 B.C. was a precise repetition of that of 207, with only one difference which Livy notes : a new hymn to Juno was composed by P. Licinius Tegula in place of the one which Andronicus had written seven years previously.

186 B.C. (L. 39.22, 2-5 ; Obs. 3) : *Ex Umbria nuntiatum est semimarem duodecim ferme annos natum inuentum.* The only detail of expiation given by Livy is *id prodigium abominantes arceri Romano agro necarique quam primum iusserunt.* The subject of *iusserunt* is supplied by Obsequens' parallel notice *aruspicum iussu necatus.* Death by drowning is not stated but may certainly be understood. There is no reference in Livy or Obsequens to the *decemviral* procession to Juno but we may observe that

from this point on notices of androgyne expiations in our sources become increasingly abbreviated and frequently note only the drowning of the *monstrum* – the single most dramatic element of the ritual (239).

142 B.C. (Obs. 22) : *Lunae androgynus natus praecepto aruspicum in mare deportatus*. (Noted also by Oros. 5.4, 8 who gives no additional information).

133 B.C. (Obs. 27) : *In agro Ferentino androgynus natus et in flumen deiectus. Virgines ter nouenae canentes urbem lustrauerunt*. It is worth noting, if Obsequens reports correctly, that this is the only instance of disposal in a river.

125 B.C. (Phlegon, *Mirab.* X = FGrHist II B 257) : "There was born at Rome an androgyne when Jason was Archon at Athens and the consuls at Rome were M. Plautius Hypsaeus and M. Fulvius Flaccus. Wherefore the Senate ordered the priests to read the oracles of the Sibyl and they expounded the oracles. The oracles are as follows : (240).

(239) Gagé, *op. cit.*, 364 is mistaken in attempting to divide the androgyne expiations on the basis of Obsequens' abbreviated notices in two distinct rites, a minimal one involving only drowning of the *monstrum* and a grander one involving the lustral procession as well.

(240) The collection of wonder tales compiled by Phlegon of Tralles is our only source for this prodigy (Obs., 30 for 125 B.C. omits it although there is a lacuna in the text in which it might have been mentioned). Phlegon appends to his notice of the androgyne what purports to be an authentic Sibylline oracle which prescribes the expiation in great detail. This long oracular text, written in difficult and partially corrupt Greek hexameters was first studied profitably by Diels, who edited it with full commentary and discussion and solved many, if not all, of its mysteries. (Müller's earlier edition and translation of the text into Latin verse is of no value).

The oracle is almost certainly genuine and is an invaluable document for the study of decemviral cult. I discuss its place in the history of the androgyne ritual below (in which I differ from Diels' interpretation).

The entire text of seventy verses is too lengthy to reproduce here. (It may be read conveniently in Jacoby, *FGrHist* unchanged from Diels' edition). I give, instead, an outline of the ritual prescriptions which may be extracted from it. Diels' ingenious analysis of the acrostich arrangement of the text allowed him to calculate the length of its several lacunae and led him to the conclusion that the text comprises, in fact, two separate oracles which Phlegon failed to distinguish (Phlegon's use of the plural, *chresmoi*, in introducing the text is not, in itself, decisive). The division into two oracles is excepted by Jacoby (*loc. cit.*) and by Rzach (*RE*, ii A. 2111) though doubted by Bucholz (*Roscher's Lexicon*, iv, 806). The division is not, in fact, certain but I have provisionally followed it here.

(Oracle I)

1. Collection of a *thesaurus* for Demeter (10-12).

2. Sacrifice of thrice-nine bulls (13). (The recipient, probably Zeus, is lost in a seven verse lacuna).

3. Sacrifice of white cows by thrice-nine maidens and a supplication performed by them in the "Greek rite" in honor of the "Basilissa" (i.e. Juno Regina (14-18)).

4. Offering by the matrons to Demeter of continuous libations. (18-19).

5. Offering by the matrons of a torch to Demeter (20).

6. The matrons repeat (4) but with a triple libation (21-23).

7. The maidens make a similar triple libation to Ploutonis (Persephone) with a prayer that she remain in the land in time of war and that forgetfulness of the city and of herself cease for the Greeks (24-28).

8. Offering of a *thesaurus* by youths and maidens (29). (The recipient of this is lost in a three verse lacuna).

(Oracle II)

Diels calculates that 39 verses have been lost from the beginning of the second oracle.

1. Offering of garments to Persephone that she may put an end to evils (30-31).

2. Gift to Persephone of whatever is fairest in the world (32-34).

3. Prayer to Demeter and Persephone to ward off the yoke from the land forever (35-36).

4. Sacrifice of a black bull to Hades-Plouton by men adorned in shining garments (= the *decemuiri* in *toga praetexta* ?) (37-38).

5. Sacrifice of white goats to Apollo (45-47).

6. Prayer to Apollo by people with heads garlanded that he may be a releaser from evil (47-49).

7. Sacrifice of a white cow to Hera Basileis (Juno Regina) (50-51).

8. Hymn (of the maidens) (52). (The object of the hymn – certainly Juno – is lost in a two verse lacuna).

9. Dedication of a carved cult statue (*xoanon*) to Hera (55-56).
10. Daily wineless libations to Hera (58-60).
11. Offering of lambs and wineless libations to the *chthonioi* (62).

The remaining eight verses of the text, before it breaks off in a lacuna of indeterminate length, are extremely obscure. There is a prediction that hermaphrodites will be born in the future (the "future" being in fact a reference to the contemporary androgyne of 125 since the oracle is couched throughout as if it had been delivered in ancient times by the Sibyl to the Cumaeans). The extant portion then concludes with an enigmatic reference to a "Trojan who will free you from evil" (241).

122 B.C. (Obs. 32) : *In foro Vessano androgynus natus in mare delatus est.*

119 B.C. (Obs. 34) : *Androgynus in agro Romano annorum octo inuentus et in mare deportatus. Virgines ter nouenae in urbe cantarunt.*

117 B.C. (Obs. 36) : *Saturniae androgynus annorum decem inuentus et mari demersus. Virgines uiginti-septem urbem carmine lustrauerunt.*

? *104 B.C.* (Obs. 43) : Mention of an androgyne is lacking in Obsequens' notice but should probably be supplied. Following a reference to a battle of heavenly arms seen in the sky the text reads, *aruspicum responso populus stipem Cereri et Proserpinae tulit. Virgines uiginti septem dona canentes tulerunt.* It seems overwhelmingly likely that this describes elements of the androgyne ritual as it existed from 125 B.C. Since these portions of the ritual, however, will have been recommended by the Sibylline Books, not by the haruspices, I suggest a lacuna after *aruspicum responso*.

? *99 B.C.* (Obs. 46) : Mention of an androgyne is similarly lacking in this notice but should be suppplied. After reference to a subterranean *fremitus* which portended famine, the text reads, *populus stipem, matronae thesaurum, et uirgines dona Cereri et Proserpinae tulerunt. Per*

(241) Verse 69 reads *τρὼς δῆτ' ἐλκύσει σε κακῶν ἅμα δ' Ἑλλάδος ἐκ γῆς*. The line (which is complete, for verse 70 begins a new thought) is difficult to interpret. Diels suggested that the second phrase is a separate compressed thought ("A Trojan will free you from evils, and from the land of Greece [help will come ?]"). But no translation seems to yield very satisfactory sense.

uirgines uiginti septem cantitatum. Signa cupressa duo Iunoni Reginae posita. This can be nothing but an androgyne expiation.

98 B.C. (Obs. 47) : *androgynus in mare deportatus.*

97 B.C. (Obs. 48) : *Supplicatum in urbe quod androgynus inuentus et in mare deportatus erat.* The following four lines contain notices of two other prodigies wrongly inserted in the middle of the androgyne entry. The entry then concludes, *cupressa simulacra Iunonis Reginae posita per uirgines uiginti septem quae urbem lustrauerunt.*

95 B.C. (Obs. 50) : *Androgynus Urbino in mare deportatus.*

92 B.C. (Obs. 53) : *Arretii duo androgyni inuenti.* The following two lines contain notices of two other prodigies wrongly inserted in the middle of the androgyne entry. The entry then concludes, *populus Cereri et Proserpinae stipem tulit. Virgines uiginti septem carmen canentes urbem lustrauerunt.*

No further androgynes are reported after 92 B.C. ([242]).

Before commenting on the expiatory ritual itself, we may first take note of the chronological distribution of the prodigies. Four androgynes are expiated in a period of 66 years from 207 to 142 B.C. Thereafter, from nine to eleven androgynes (allowing for the uncertain instances in 104 and 99 B.C.) are expiated in the 42 year span from 133 to 92 B.C. Of these, five (or, at least, four) fall in the 90's B.C. This distribution patterns well with the overall rise in haruspicial activity in this period which we have noticed ([243]). Apparently, notwithstanding the participation of Roman *decemuiri* in the ritual, the prodigy and its expiation were never felt to have lost their peculiarly Etruscan flavor, and the frequency with which androgynes were reported to the Senate must reflect, as do the frequencies of other haruspicial activities, a condition of mounting anxiety in, and concerning, Etruria from the Gracchan period to the Social War. Certainly the inauguration of the rite in 207 B.C. responded to such anxiety at the time of Hasdrubal's invasion of Italy.

(242) There are two later prodigies involving miraculous sex changes but, as pointed out in note 238 above, these were not strictly speaking androgynes and were not treated as such.

(243) Refer to Appendix A, p. 106.

Turning to the content of the ritual, the most remarkable aspect of the expiation is the fact that it appears to have undergone a major restructuring by at the latest 125 B.C. on the evidence of the oracle (or oracles) preserved by Phlegon. That text concerns itself, of course, only with the *decemviral* portion of the rite. There is no reference in it to the disposal of the *monstrum*, nor should we expect any. That activity fell to the haruspices, who certainly performed it on that occasion as they did both earlier and later.

I have already noted Diels' contribution to our understanding of the oracle in what remains the only thorough study devoted to it, but I cannot accept his conclusions on the dating of the ritual which it describes. Diels argued that the two oracles (as he identified them) corresponded to the first two androgyne prodigies of 207 and 200 B.C. respectively. He went on to suggest that they might have been composed in fact by no less a personage than Fabius Pictor whom he suggested (not without reason) was a member of the *decemviral* college. The oracles were associated by Phlegon with the androgyne of 125 B.C. only because, in Diels' view, they were presumably published in that year, perhaps as a palliative to panic in the city at the time of the revolt of Fregellae ([244]).

The ritual described in Phlegon's text can be equated with that described by Livy for 207 only on the assumption (which Diels was willing to make) that Livy omitted to describe major portions of the rite. But, on the contrary, Livy's account gives the impression of unusual thoroughness and it is impossible that he, or his source, overlooked all of the acts to Demeter and Persephone which occupy such a large part of the oracular prescriptions. The two rituals cannot be wholly equated and we should conclude rather that the Phlegontic oracle represents a distinct later stage in the development of the rite ([245]). Subsequently to 125 B.C. parts of the new ritual are reflected in three of our androgyne notices : In 104 B.C. and 99 B.C. (both years in which mention of an androgyne is lacking though it can be safely supplied) and in 92 B.C., in definite connection with an androgyne, we have mention of the offering of a *stips* or *thesaurus* to Ceres and Proserpina as well as to the lustral procession and hymn of the twenty-seven maidens ([246]). There is no reference to Ceres and Proserpina in any of the androgyne notices earlier than 125 B.C.

(244) Diels, *op. cit.*, 90 ff.

(245) The point is recognized also by Le Bonniec, *op. cit.*, 455.

(246) The absence of Ceres and Proserpina from six other notices subsequent to 125 must be ascribed to the characteristic brevity of Obsequens.

The easiest (and perhaps correct) solution is simply to assume that the ritual was altered for some reason that eludes us in precisely the year to which Phlegon assigns the oracle. It is possible, however, that the change occurred somewhat earlier than this. If we exclude the androgynes of 207 and 200 whose expiation cannot be equated with the Phlegontic ritual, there remain to be considered, so far we know, only three possible occasions prior to 125 B.C. on which the change can have been made: 186, 142 and 133 B.C. There can be no certainty in preferring any one of these dates (all three occasions are reported to us in extremely abbreviated form), but I call attention to the fact that in 133 B.C., on the evidence of Cicero, the *decemuiri* performed a religious pilgrimage to the *antiquissima Ceres* of Sicilian Enna. I have discussed this passage above and, following Le Bonniec, I see its main significance as a response to Sicilian popular feeling at the conclusion of the uprising of Syrian slaves, under the patronage of their goddess Atargitis, which centered on Enna and undoubtedly brought defilement on Demeter's holy place [247]. The Sicilian uprising was accompanied by outbreaks in Italy as well, where revolts were put down at Minturnae, Sinuessa, and at Rome itself [248]. It may be suggested that at this moment of grave crisis the occasion of an androgyne prodigy presented an additional opportunity to appease the Sicilian Triad, Demeter, Persephone, and Hades and to acknowledge the sentiments of Sicilian Greeks who honored them, by including them alongside Juno Regina in a redesigned rite. At least we know of no other androgyne year in which at the same time a significant religious gesture was made to Ceres [249].

Diels argues for his dating of the oracles by reference to the propaganda content of the prayer to Persephone that she "remain in the land in time of war and that forgetfulness of the city and of herself cease for the Greeks" (24-28), and of the subsequent prayers addressed to her, Demeter, and Apollo that they "ward off the yoke" and "put an end to evils" (30-31, 35-36, 47-49), as well as to the obviously significant, though obscure,

(247) Above, p. 38.

(248) Oros., 5.9, 4.

(249) Le Bonniec (*op. cit.*, 400 ff.) argues, to be sure, tha the pilgrimage to Enna did not result in the importation of Sicilian Demeter to Rome, as, for example, Venus Erycina had been imported in 217 B.C. This is no doubt correct but, as Le B. also points out, all of the Hellenic Demeter cults had much in common and one such cult, the *sacra Graeca Cereris*, had already been institutionalized at Rome. It was only necessary to incorporate these familiar elements in a new rite that would honor Demeter in a fashion unmistakable to Sicilian Greeks.

reference to the "Trojan" at the conclusion of the oracle (250). These sentiments could, indeed, as Diels argued, reflect Roman propaganda at the time of the Second Punic War and at the beginning of the Second Macedonian War (251) – were it not for the fact that the Phlegontic oracles cannot on other grounds be associated with those first two androgyne expiations. But the tenor of the prayers will, I think, fit as well the situation of 133. The concluding reference to the "Trojan", in fact, while it is an appropriate designation for Romans to adopt for themselves with a view to a Sicilian audience may have been intended equally as well for still another audience. 133 B.C. was also the year in which Rome acquired the province of Asia, the former kingdom of Pergamum, where anti-Roman feeling and generalized social unrest among the poor was about to erupt in the rebellion of Aristonicus. One is tempted to think that the reference to a Trojan as savior, conveying the ancestral kinship of Romans and Pergamenes, finds its best interpretation here.

The question remains whether we have in fact one oracle or two and, if two, whether they must be referred to two separate androgyne prodigies. I am inclined to think that there is only one oracle produced for one occasion. The contents of the two "halves" are wholly distinct except for one point of overlap : the sacrifice of white cows to the "Basilissa" or Hera Basileis is prescribed in verses 14 ff. and 50 ff. But this repetition need cause no difficulty in a text as disjointedly composed as this one.

If I am right in thinking that the oracle was composed for the expiation of 133, I have no better suggestion to make than Diels did as to why Phlegon associated it with the androgyne of 125. Presumably it was publicly circulated for the first time in that year. We may note that the sentiments expressed in the prayers would not be wholly inappropriate in the context of an impending Latin revolt, although I suspect that if the oracle had been newly composed in 125, references to Latin disloyalty would have been more specific (252). It is, in any case, clear, as Diels fully appreciated, that the Phlegontic androgyne ritual, whatever its date, was designed to convey one or more significant political messages in religious guise and, therefore, stands as still another example of the use of prodigies and expiations for propaganda purposes.

(250) Though it should be noted that this line is not to be spoken in any of the public prayers.

(251) Diels, *op. cit.*, 92 ff.

(252) The appropriate line was already at hand in the saecular oracle ; see above, p. 34 ff.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

AFZELIUS, A., *Die römische Eroberung Italiens : 340-264 v. Chr.* Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1942.

BELOCH, J., *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege.* Berlin, de Gruyter, 1926.

BÉMONT, C., "Les enterrés vivants du Forum Boarium". *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 72 (1960), 133-146.

BLOCH, G., "Duumviri sacris faciundis". *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, edited by Daremberg-Saglio, II, 1, 426-442. Paris, Hachette, 1896.

BLOCH, R., "Origines étrusques des livres Sibyllins". *Mélanges offerts à A. Ernout.* Paris, Klincksieck, 1940, 21-28.

——, "Les prodiges romains et la *procuratio prodigiorum*". *Mélanges Fernand de Visscher* = Vol. 1 of *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité.* Brussels, 1950, 119-131.

——, "Rome de 509 à 475 environ av. J.-C.", *Revue des études latines*, 37 (1959), 118-131.

——, "La divination romaine et les livres Sibyllins". *Revue des études latines*, 40 (1962), 118-120.

——, *Les prodiges dans l'antiquité classique.* Paris, P.U.F., 1963.

——, "La liberté et la déterminisme dans la divination romaine". *Hommages à J. Bayet = Collection Latomus*, 70, Brussels, 1964, 89-100.

——, "Liberté et déterminisme dans la divination étrusque". *Studi in honore L. Banti.* Rome, L'Erma, 1965, 63-68.

BOEMER, F., "Kybele in Rom : Die Geschichte ihres Kults als politische Phänomen". *Mitt. des deutschen archäologischen Instituts*, Abt. 71 (1964), 130-151.

BOUCHÉ-LECLERQ, A., "Haruspices". *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, edited by DAREMBERG-SAGLIO, III, 1, 17-33. Paris, Hachette, 1900.

——, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, tome IV. Paris, Leroux, 1882.

BOYCE, A. A., "The Expiatory Rites of 207 B.C.", *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 68 (1937), 157-171.

——, "The Development of the *Decemviri sacris faciundis*". Transactions of the American Philological Association, 69 (1938), 161-187.

BRUNT, P. A., "Italian Aims at the Time of the Social War". *Journal of Roman Studies*, 55 (1965), 90-109.

CARCOPINO, J., *La loi de Hieron et les Romains*. Paris, Boccard, 1914.

CICHORIUS, C., *Römische Studien*. Leipzig, Teubner, 1922.

CLEMEN, C. *Die Religion der Etrusker*. Bonn, Röhrscheid, 1936.

CORNELL, T. J., "Etruscan Historiography". *Annali di Pisa* ser. iii, 6 (1976), 411-39.

COUSIN, J., "La crise religieuse de 207 av. J.-C.", *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 126 (1943), 15-41.

CRAKE, J. E. A., "The Annals of the Pontifex Maximus". *Classical Philology*, 35 (1940), 375-386.

DEROY, L., "À propos du nom étrusque de l'haruspice". *Latomus*, 15, fasc. 2 (1956), 206-214.

DIELS, H., *Sibyllinische Blätter*. Berlin, Reimer, 1890.

EVANS, E. C. *The Cults of the Sabine Territory*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, vol. xi. Rome, 1939.

FABRE, P., "Minime romano sacro". *Revue des études anciennes*, 42 (1940), 419-424.

GABBA, E., "Le origini della guerra sociale e la vita politica romana dopo l'89 a.C.", *Athenaeum*, n.s. 32 (1954), 41-114.

GAGÉ, J., *Apollon romain : essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développement du ritus graecus à Rome des origines à Auguste*. Bibl. des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 182, 1955.

——, "Une consultation d'haruspices : sur les tabous étrusques et la statue dite d'Horatius Cocles". *Latomus*, 32, fasc. 1 (1973), 3-22.

GALINSKY, G. K., *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome*. Princeton, University Press, 1969.

GORDON, A. E., "The Cults of Aricia". *Univ. of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, II, 1 (1934), 1-19.

——, "The Cults of Lanuvium", *Univ. of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, II, 2 (1935), 21-58.

GRAILLOT, H., *Le culte de Cybèle, mère des dieux, à Rome et dans l'empire romain*. Paris, Fontemoing, 1912.

GRENIER, A., *Les religions étrusque et romaine*. Paris, P.U.F., 1948.

GUENTHER, R., "Der politisch-ideologische Kampf in der römischen Religion in der letzten zwei Jahrhunderten v. u. z.", *Klio*, 42 (1964), 209-297.

HAHM, D. E., "Roman Nobility and the Three Major Priesthoods, 218 to 167 B.C.", *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 94 (1963), 73-85.

HÄNDEL, P., "Prodigium" in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edited by Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, XXIII, 2 2283-2296. Stuttgart, 1959.

HARRIS, W. V., "Roman *foedera* in Etruria". *Historia*, 14 (1965), 282-292.

——, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971.

——, "A Note on the Roman Conquest of Etruria". *Historia*, 22 (1973), 356-358.

HERBIG, G., *Religion und Kultus der Etrusker*. Mitt. der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, Bd. 23 (1921).

HERBIG, R., "Zur Religion und Religiosität der Etrusker". *Historia*, 6 (1957), 123-132.

HERRMANN, L., "Carmina Marciana". *Hommages à Georges Dumézil. Collection Latomus*, 45, Brussels, 1960.

HEURGON, J., "Tarquitius Priscus et l'organisation de l'ordre des haruspices sous l'empereur Claude". *Latomus*, 12 (1953), 402-417.

——, "L'état étrusque". *Historia*, 6 (1957), 63-97.

——, "The Date of Vegoia's Prophecy". *Journal of Roman Studies*, 49 (1959), 41-45.

——, *Daily Life of the Etruscans*. Translated by James Kirkup. New York, Macmillan, 1964.

JONES, G. D. B., "Capena and the Ager Capenas". *Publications of the British School at Rome*, 30 (1962), 116-207 and 31 (1963), 100-158.

KOEVES, Th., "Zum Empfang der Magna Mater in Rom". *Historia*, 12 (1963), 321-347.

KRAUSS, F. B., *An Interpretation of the Omens, Portents and Prodigies Recorded by Livy, Tacitus and Suetonius*. Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1930.

LATTE, K., *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich, Beck, 1960.

LE BONNIEC, H., *Le culte de Cérès à Rome des origines à la fin de république*. Paris, Klincksieck, 1958.

LEICHTY, E., "Tertalogical Omens", in *La divination en Mésopotamie ancienne*. Strasbourg, 1966.

LENAGHAN, J. O., *A Commentary on Cicero's Oration. "De Haruspicum Responso"*. The Hague, Mouton, 1969.

LEWIS, R. G., Review of W. V. HARRIS, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. *Journal of Roman Studies*, 63 (1973), 247-249.

LUTERBACHER, Fr., *Die Prodigienglaube und Prodigienstil der Römer*. Programm Burgdorf, 1880.

MOMMSEN, Th., "Epistula de Romanorum Prodigiis ad Ottonem Jahnium", in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 7, 168-174. Berlin, 1912.

MÜLLER, K. O. and DEECKE, W., *Die Etrusker*. 2 vols. Stuttgart, Heitz, 1877.

MÜNZER, Fr., "Marcius, no. 65" in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edited by Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, XIV, 2, 1560. Stuttgart, 1928.

OGILVIE, R. M., *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965.

PALLOTTINO, M., *The Etruscans*. Translated by J. Cremona from the 6th Italian edition. London, Allen Lane, 1975.

PALMER, R. E. A., *Roman Religion and Roman Empire*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

PEASE, A. S., ed., "M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione Libri Duo". *Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, 6 (1920), 161-500 and 8 (1923), 153-474. (Reprinted in one volume by Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1963).

PFIFFIG, A. J., "Die Haltung Etruriens im zweiten punischen Krieg". *Historia*, 15 (1966), 193-210.

——, *Die Ausbreitung des römischen Städtewesens in Etrurien und die Frage der Unterwerfung der Etrusker*. Florence, 1966.

——, "Das Verhalten Etruriens im Samnitenkrieg und nachher bis zum ersten punischen Krieg". *Historia*, 17 (1968), 307-350.

——, *Religio Etrusca*. Graz, 1973.

PIGANIOL, A., "Sur le calendrier brontoscopique de Nigidius Figulus". *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*. Princeton, University Press, 1951, 79-87.

PIGHI, I. B., *De ludis saecularibus populi Romani Quiritium libri sex*. 2nd edition. Amsterdam, Schippers, 1965.

PIOTROWICZ, L., "Quelques remarques sur l'attitude de l'Étrurie pendant les troubles civils à la fin de la république romaine". *Klio*, 23 (1930), 334-338.

RADKE, G., "Quindecemviri sacris faciundis", in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edited by PAULY-WISSOWA-KROLL, XXIV, 1114-1148. Stuttgart, 1963.

RAWSON, E., "Prodigy Lists and the Use of the *Annales Maximi*". *Classical Quarterly*, 21 (1971), 158-169.

——, "Religion and Politics in the Late Second Century at Rome". *Phoenix*, 28 (1974), 193-212.

——, "Caesar, Etruria, and the Disciplina Etrusca". *JRS*, 68 (1978), 132-152.

RZACH, A., "Sibyllen ; Sibyllinisch Orakel", in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edited by PAULY-WISSOWA-KROLL, 2nd ser., II, 2073-2117. Stuttgart, 1923.

SAINT-DENIS, E., "Les énumérations de prodiges dans l'œuvre de Tite-Live". *Revue de philologie*, 16 (1942), 126-142.

SALMON, E. T., *Samnium and the Samnites*. Cambridge : University Press, 1967.

——, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*. Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1970.

SCHANZ, M. and HOSIUS, C., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, vol. I. 4th ed. Munich : Beck, 1927.

SCHILLING, R., *La religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste*. Paris, Boccard, 1954.

SCHMIDT, P. L., *Iulius Obsequens und das Problem der Livius-Epitome : Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der lateinischen Prodigienliteratur*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, N.R. 5. Wiesbaden, 1968.

SCHWENN, Fr., *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuchen und Vorarbeiten, 15, 3. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1915.

SZEMLER, G. J., *The Priests of the Roman Republic. Collection Latomus*, 127. Brussels, 1972.

TAYLOR, L. R., *Local Cults in Etruria*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, vol. 2, 1923.

——, "New Light on the History of the Secular Games". *American Journal of Philology*, 55 (1934), 101-120.

TORELLI, M., *Elogia Tarquiniensia (Studi e Materiali di Etruscologia e Antichità Italiche*, XV). Florence, Sansoni, 1975.

THULIN, C. O., *Die etruskische Disciplin*. Göteborg, Zachrissons, 1906-1909.

——, "Etrusca disciplina" in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edited by Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, VII, 1, 725-730. Stuttgart, 1907.

TOYNBEE, A. J., *Hannibal's Legacy*. 2 vols. London, Oxford University Press, 1965.

VAN SON, D. W. L., "The Disturbances in Etruria during the Second Punic War". *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, vol. 16 (1963), 267-274.

WALLBANK, F. W., Review of W. V. Harris : *Rome in Etruria and Umbria. Classical Review*, 24, 1 (1974), 92-94.

WALSH, P. G., *Livy : His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge University Press, 1961.

WEINREICH, O., "Omina- und Prodigienkataloge in ältesten römischen Epos", in *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson*, vol. 2, 1147-1154. St. Louis, 1953.

WEINSTOCK, S., "C. Fonteius Capito and the Libri Tagetici". *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 18, n.s. vol. 5 (1950), 44-49.

——, "Libri Fulgurales". *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 19, n.s. vol. 6 (1951), 122-153.

WISSOWA, G., *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd ed. Munich, Beck, 1912.

WÜLKER, L., *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Prodigienwesens bei den Römern*. Diss., Leipzig, 1903.

COLLECTION LATOMUS

60, rue Colonel Chaltin, B. 1180 Bruxelles

C.C.P. 000-0752646-23 de la Société d'Études Latines de Bruxelles

LXIX. – L. Herrmann, **Les fables antiques de la broderie de Bayeux** (1964), 62 p., 21 x 28, in-8°, 42 pl. .... 220 F.
LXX. – **Hommages à Jean Bayet** (1964), xvi-752 p. in-8°, 44 pl. .... 1.100 F.
Exemplaire de luxe sur featherweight .... 1.600 F.
LXXI. – G. B. Fletcher, **Annotations on Tacitus** (1964), 108 p. in-8° .... 260 F.
LXXII. – P. Decouflé, **La notion d'ex-voto anatomiques chez les Étrusco-Romains** (1964), 44 p. in-8°, 19 pl. .... 180 F.
LXXIII. – B. Fenik, **«Iliad X» and the «Rhesus». The Myth** (1964), 64 p. in-8° .... 200 F.
LXXIV. – M. Amit, **Athens and the Sea. A Study in Athenian Sea-Power** (1965), 150 p. in-8° .... *Épuisé*
LXXV. – C. B. Pascal, **The Cults of Cisalpine Gaul** (1964), 222 p. in-8°, 1 carte .... 450 F.
LXXVI. – J.-M. Croisille, **Les natures mortes campaniennes. Répertoire descriptif des peintures de nature morte du Musée National de Naples, de Pompéi, Herculanum et Stabies** (1965), 134 p. 21 x 28, in-8°, 127 pl. .... 700 F.
LXXVII. – H. Zehnacker, **Les statues du sanctuaire de Kamart (Tunisie)** (1965), 86 p. in-8°, 17 pl. .... 250 F.
LXXVIII. – L. Herrmann, **La vision de Patmos** (1965), 150 p. in-8° .... 400 F.
LXXIX. – U. Pestalozza, **L'éternel féminin dans la religion méditerranéenne** (1965), 83 p. in-8° .... 225 F.
LXXX. – D. Tudor, **Sucidava, une cité daco-romaine en Dacie** (1965), 140 p. in-8°, 35 fig., 30 pl. .... 380 F.
LXXXI. – J. Fitz, **Ingenuus et Régalien** (1966), 72 p. in-8° .... 350 F.
LXXXII. – J. Colin, **Les villes libres de l'Orient gréco-romain et l'envoi au supplice par acclamations populaires** (1965), 176 p. in-8°, 5 pl. .... 380 F.
LXXXIII. – J. Schwartz, **Biographie de Lucien de Samosate** (1965), 168 p. in-8° .... 250 F.
LXXXIV. – Virgile, **Les Bucoliques**. Traduction en vers de H. des Abbayes. Avant-propos de E. De Saint-Denis (1966), 92 p. in-8° .... 250 F.
LXXXV. – J. Balty, **Essai d'iconographie de l'empereur Clodius Albinus** (1966), 70 p. in-8°, 10 pl. .... 250 F.
LXXXVI. – M. Delcourt, **Hermaphroditea** (1966), 76 p. in-8°, 10 pl. .... 250 F.
LXXXVII. – M.-P. Loicq-Berger, **Syracuse. Histoire culturelle d'une cité grecque** (1967), 320 p. in-8°, 21 pl. .... 800 F.
LXXXVIII. – J. K. Newman, **Augustus and the New Poetry** (1967), 458 p. in-8° .... 800 F.
LXXXIX. – J. K. Newman, **The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry** (1967), 132 p. in-8° .... 300 F.
XC. – L. W. Daly, **A Contribution to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages** (1967), 100 p. in-8° .... 250 F.
XCI. – R. Turcan, **Sénèque et les religions orientales** (1967), 70 p. in-8° .... 210 F.
XCII. – **Conférences de la Société d'Études Latines de Bruxelles 1965-1966** (1968), éd. G. Cambier, 132 p. in-8° .... 225 F.
XCIII. – A. Balil, **Lucernae singulares** (1968), 98 p. in-8° .... 260 F.
XCIV. – D. Michel, **Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und Marcus Antonius. Archäologische Untersuchungen** (1968), 140 p. gr. in-8°, 34 pl. .... 375 F.
XCV. – P. Antin, **Recueil sur saint Jérôme** (1968), 474 p. in-8° .... 850 F.
XCVI. – Avianus, **Œuvres** éd. et trad. par L. Herrmann (1968), 177 p. in-8° .... 370 F.
XCVII. – L. Bakelants, **La vie et les œuvres de Gislain Bulteel d'Ypres** (1555-1611). Contribution à l'histoire de l'humanisme dans les Pays-Bas. Ouvrage édité par G. Cambier (1968), 490 p. in-8°, 1 pl. .... 900 F.
XCVIII. – Émile Thevenot, **Les voies romaines de la Cité des Éduens** (1969), 338 p. in-8°, 3 dépliants .... 660 F.
XCIX. – R. Stuveras, **Le putto dans l'art romain** (1969), 240 p. in-8°, 82 pl. .... 600 F.
C. – M. J. McGann, **Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles** (1969), 118 p. in-8° .... 275 F.
101-103. – **Hommages à Marcel Renard**, édités par J. Bibauw (1969).
I. Langues, littératures, droit. xxviii-812 p. in-8°, 14 pl. .... 1.300 F.
II. Histoire, histoire des religions, épigraphie. xxviii-868 p. in-8°, 41 pl. .... 1.400 F.
III. Archéologie, étruscologie, numismatique. xxviii-720 p. in-8°, 25 pl. .... 1.600 F.
104. – J. Veremans, **Éléments symboliques dans la III^e Bucolique de Virgile** (1969), 76 p. in-8° .... 225 F.
105. – F. Benoit, **Le symbolisme dans les sanctuaires de la Gaule** (1970), 109 p. in-8°, 38 pl. .... 375 F.
106. – B. Liou, **Praetores Etruriae XV populorum** (Étude d'épigraphie) (1969), 118 p. in-8°, 16 pl. .... 300 F.
107. – M. van den Bruwaene, **Cicéron, De natura deorum, Livre I^er** (1970), 191 p. in-8° .... 425 F.
108. – K. Schefold, **La peinture pompéienne** (1972), 282 p. in-8°, 56 pl. .... 850 F.
109. – L. Herrmann, **Chrestos. Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle** (1970), 173 p. in-8° .... *Épuisé*
110. – M. Rachet, **Rome et les Berbères** (1970), 313 p. in-8°, 15 pl. .... 800 F.
111. – G. A. Mansuelli, **Urbanistica e architettura della Cisalpina romana fino al III sec. e.n.** (1971), 228 p., 105 pl. (2 volumes) .... 1.100 F.
112. – **Catulli carmina**, éd. H. Bardon (1970), 229 p. in-8° .... 475 F.
113. – É. Thevenot, **Le Beaunois gallo-romain** (1971), 292 p. in-8°, 17 pl. .... 700 F.
114. – **Hommages à Marie Delcourt** (1970), xii-442 p. in-8°, 17 pl. .... 950 F.
115. – M. Meslin, **La fête des kalendes de janvier dans l'empire romain** (1970), 138 p. in-8° .... 325 F.
116. – M. Reinhold, **History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity** (1970), 74 p. in-8° .... 220 F.
117. – W. L. Dulière, **La haute terminologie de la rédaction johannique** (1970), 83 p. in-8° .... 230 F.
118. – H. Bardon, **Propositions sur Catulle** (1970), 160 p. in-8° .... 400 F.
119. – V. Righini, **Lineamenti di storia economica della Gallia Cisalpina : la produttività fittile in età repubblicana** (1970), 102 p. in-8°, 1 pl. .... 275 F.
120. – R. P. H. Green, **The Poetry of Paulinus of Nola** (1971), 148 p. in-8° .... 375 F.
121. – P. Boyancé, **Études sur l'humanisme cicéronien** (1970), 352 p. in-8° .... 700 F.
122. – J. Fitz, **Les Syriens à Intercisa** (1972), 264 p. in-8°, 2 pl. .... 650 F.
123. – I. Stoian, **Études histriennes** (1972), 176 p. in-8°, 15 pl. .... 500 F.
124. – J. J. Jully, **La céramique attique de la Monédière, Bessan, Hérault** (1973), 362 p. in-8°, 30 pl., 34 dessins, 12 tableaux (2 volumes) .... 1.200 F.
125. – H. de Ley, **Macrobius and Numenius** (1972), 76 p. in-8° .... 250 F.
126. – P. Tordeur, **Concordance de Paulin de Pella** (1973), 122 p. in-8° .... 375 F.
127. – G. J. Szemler, **The Priests of the Roman Republic** (1972), 225 p. in-8° .... 600 F.
128. – B. Mortureux, **Recherches sur le «De clementia» de Sénèque** (1973), 88 p. in-8° .... 300 F.
129. – P. Broise, **Genève et son territoire dans l'Antiquité** (1974), 370 p. in-8°, 17 pl., 47 cartes (2 volumes) .... 1.750 F.

COLLECTION LATOMUS

60, rue Colonel Chaltin, B. 1180 Bruxelles

C.C.P. 000-0752646-23 de la Société d'Études Latines de Bruxelles

130. – J. C. M. Richard, **La région montpelliéraine à l'époque préromaine (750-121 avant J.-C.)** (1973), 166 p. in-8°, 18 pl. .... 650 F.
131. – A. Piganiol, **Scripta varia** édités par R. Bloch, A. Chastagnol, R. Chevallier et M. Renard. **I. Généralités** (1973), 564 p. in-8°, 5 pl. .... 1.600 F.
132. – A. Piganiol, **Scripta varia**, édités par R. Bloch, A. Chastagnol, R. Chevallier et M. Renard. **II. Les origines de Rome et la République** (1973), 384 p. in-8°, 9 pl. .... 1.100 F.
133. – A. Piganiol, **Scripta varia**, édités par R. Bloch, A. Chastagnol, R. Chevallier et M. Renard. **III. L'Empire** (1973), 388 p. in-8°, 13 pl. .... 1.100 F.
134. – M. Amit, **Great and Small Poleis. A Study in the Relations between the Great Powers and the Small Cities in Ancient Greece**, (1973), 194 p. in-8° .... 650 F.
135. – L. Herrmann, **Babrius et ses poèmes** (1973), 250 p. in-8° .... 850 F.
136. – H. Hierche, **Les Épodes d'Horace. Art et signification** (1974), 212 p. in-8° .... 650 F.
137. – P. Salmon, **Population et dépopulation dans l'Empire romain** (1974), 182 p. in-8° .... 600 F.
138. – M. Gramatopol, **Les pierres gravées du Cabinet Numismatique de l'Académie roumaine** (1974), 131 p. in-8°, 47 pl. .... 600 F.
139. – A. Hus, **Les bronzes étrusques** (1975), 164 p. in-8°, 75 pl. .... 800 F.
140. – St. Priuli, **Ascyltus. Note di onomastica petroniana** (1975), 67 p. in-8°, 4 pl. .... 225 F.
141. – R. C. Blockley, **Ammianus Marcellinus. A Study of his Historiography and Political Thought** (1975), 211 p. in-8° .... 650 F.
142. – I. Shatzman, **Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics** (1975), 512 p. in-8° .... 1.550 F.
143. – A. Sauvage, **Étude de thèmes animaliers dans la poésie latine. Le cheval – Les oiseaux** (1975), 293 p. in-8° .. 900 F.
144. – P. Defosse, **Bibliographie étrusque. Tome II (1927-1950)** (1976), 345 p. in-8° .... 1.200 F.
145. – **Hommages à André Boutemy**, édités par G. Cambier (1976), 452 p. in-8°, 27 pl. .... 1.450 F.
146. – A. Hus, **Les siècles d'or de l'histoire étrusque (675-475 avant J.-C.)** (1976), 288 p. in-8°, 49 pl. .... 1.100 F.
147. – J. V. Cody, **Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics** (1976), 130 p. in-8° .... 400 F.
148. – J. Fitz, **La Pannonie sous Gallien** (1976), 88 p. in-8° .... 275 F.
149. – J. W. Rich, **Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion** (1976), 145 p. in-8° 450 F.
150. – A. Desmouliez, **Cicéron et son goût** (1976), 637 p. in-8° .... 2.000 F.
151. – N. Rouland, **Les esclaves romains en temps de guerre** (1977), 106 p. in-8° .... 350 F.
152. – J. Gagé, **Enquêtes sur les structures sociales et religieuses de la Rome primitive** (1977), 631 p. in-8° .... 2.000 F.
153. – J. Ramin, **La technique minière et métallurgique des Anciens** (1977), 223 p. in-8° .... 700 F.
154. – M. van den Bruwaene, **Cicéron, De natura deorum, Livre II** (1978), 224 p. in-8° .... 700 F.
155. – T. D. Barnes, **The Sources of the *Historia Augusta*** (1978), 135 p. in-8° .... 450 F.
156. – P. Gros, **Architecture et Société à Rome et en Italie centro-méridionale aux deux derniers siècles de la République** (1978), 101 p. in-8°, 22 pl. .... 400 F.
157. – K. R. Bradley, **Suetonius' *Life of Nero*. An historical Commentary** (1978), 301 p. in-8° .... 900 F.
158. – G. Cambier, C. Deroux, J. Préaux†, **Lettres latines du moyen âge et de la Renaissance** (1978), 249 p. in-8°, 5 pl. 750 F.
159. – F. Desbordes, **Argonautica. Trois études sur l'imitation dans la littérature antique** (1979), 117 p. in-8° .... 400 F.
160. – **Le «bucchero nero» étrusque et sa diffusion en Gaule Méridionale** (1979), 170 p. in-8°, 65 pl., 4 dépl. ..... 900 F.
161. – R. Develin, **Patterns in Office-Holding, 366-49 B.C.** (1979), 109 p. in-8° .... 350 F.
162. – G. S. Olmsted, **The Gundestrup Cauldron** (1979), 306 p. in-8°, 84 pl. .... 1.500 F.
163. – G. Bonelli, **Aporie etiche in Epicuro** (1979), 135 p. in-8° .... 450 F.
164. – **Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History**, edited by Carl Deroux. **Vol. I** (1979), 542 p. in-8° .... 2.000 F.
165. – N. J. E. Austin, **Ammianus on Warfare. An Investigation into Ammianus' Military Knowledge** (1979), 171 p. in-8° .... 650 F.
166. – N. Rouland, **Pouvoir politique et dépendance personnelle dans l'Antiquité romaine. Genèse et rôle des rapports de clientèle** (1979), 658 p. in-8° .... 2.500 F.
167. – L. Herrmann, **Sénèque et les premiers chrétiens** (1979), 92 p. in-8° .... 375 F.
168. – **Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History**, edited by Carl Deroux. **Vol. II** (1980), 532 p. in-8° .... 2.000 F.
169. – Y. Shochat, **Recruitment and the Programme of Tiberius Gracchus** (1980), 98 p. in-8° .... 400 F.
170. – B. R. Nagle, **The Poetics of Exile. Program and Polemic in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* of Ovid** (1980), 184 p. in-8° .... 750 F.
171. – M. Grondona, **La religione e la superstizione nella *Cena Trimalchionis*** (1980), 104 p. in-8°, 10 pl. .... 475 F.
172. – L. Catlow, *Pervigilium Veneris* (1980), 105 p. in-8° .... 400 F.
173. – Z. Rubin, **Civil-War Propaganda and Historiography** (1980), 247 p. in-8° .... 1.000 F.
174. – G. Dury-Moyaers, **Énée et Lavinium. À propos de découvertes archéologiques récentes**. Préface de F. Castagnoli (1981), 252 p. in-8°, XXXVII pl. .... 1.200 F.
175. – M. van den Bruwaene, **Cicéron, De Natura Deorum. Livre III** (1981), 212 p. in-8° .... 900 F
176. – Y. A. Dauge, **Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation** (1981), x-859 p. in-8°, 1 pl., 2 dépl. .... 3.000 F.
177. – B. MacBain, **Prodigy and Expiation : a study in religion and politics in Republican Rome** (1982), 140 p. in-8° 675 F.

Coll. Latomus (hors série). – J. Ch. Balty et G. Cambier, avec la collaboration de J. Balty, Latomus, Revue d'études latines. Tables générales des tomes I (1937) à XX (1961), 264 p. in-8° .... 400 F.

Coll. Latomus (hors série). – G. Cambier, Latomus, Revue d'études latines. Tables générales des tomes XXI (1962) à XXV (1966), 156 p. in-8° .... 350 F.

Frais de port et d'expédition en sus.

IMPRIMERIE UNIVERSA, WETTEREN (BELGIQUE)